Race and Nation
in the Age of Emancipations

EDITED BY WHITNEY NELL STEWART AND JOHN GARRISON MARKS

VISIT…

Race and Nation in
the Age of Emancipations

Race in the Atlantic World, 1700–1900

SERIES EDITORS

Richard S. Newman, *Rochester Institute of Technology*
Patrick Rael, *Bowdoin College*
Manisha Sinha, *University of Massachusetts, Amherst*

ADVISORY BOARD

Edward Baptist, *Cornell University*
Christopher Brown, *Columbia University*
Vincent Carretta, *University of Maryland*
Laurent Dubois, *Duke University*
Erica Armstrong Dunbar, *University of Delaware and the Library Company of Philadelphia*
Douglas Egerton, *LeMoyne College*
Leslie Harris, *Emory University*
Joanne Pope Melish, *University of Kentucky*
Sue Peabody, *Washington State University, Vancouver*
Erik Seeman, *State University of New York, Buffalo*
John Stauffer, *Harvard University*

Race and Nation in the Age of Emancipations

EDITED BY

Whitney Nell Stewart

John Garrison Marks

The University of Georgia Press

ATHENS

© 2018 by the University of Georgia Press
Athens, Georgia 30602
www.ugapress.org
All rights reserved
Designed by Kaelin Chappell Broaddus
Set in 11/13.5 Fournier MT Std by
Graphic Composition, Inc.
Bogart, Georgia

Most University of Georgia Press titles are
available from popular e-book vendors.

Printed digitally

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data
Names: Stewart, Whitney Nell, editor. | Marks, John Garrison, editor.
Title: Race and nation in the age of emancipations / edited by Whitney Nell Stewart, John Garrison Marks.
Description: Athens, Georgia : University of Georgia Press, 2018. | Series: Race in the Atlantic world, 1700–1900 | Includes bibliographical references.
Identifiers: LCCN 2017047637 | ISBN 9780820353104 (hbk : alk. paper) | ISBN 9780820353111 (pbk : alk. paper) | ISBN 9780820353098 (ebook)
Subjects: LCSH: Liberty—History. | Freedom—History. | Citizenship—History.
Classification: LCC JC596 .R33 2018 | DDC 323.1196/01821—dc23
LC record available at https://lccn.loc.gov/2017047637

CONTENTS

Foreword: Nations beyond Nations
JULIE SAVILLE *vii*

Acknowledgments *xiii*

Introduction
WHITNEY NELL STEWART AND
JOHN GARRISON MARKS *1*

PART 1. *Mobility and Migration*

Freedom, Reenslavement, and Movement
in the Revolutionary South
MATTHEW SPOONER *13*

To Fashion Ourselves Citizens: Colonization,
Belonging, and the Problem of Nationhood
in the Atlantic South, 1829–1859
ANDREW N. WEGMANN *35*

Exiles in America: Canadian Anti-Black Racism and the
Meaning of Nation in the Age of the 1848 Revolutions
IKUKO ASAKA *53*

PART 2. *Law and Legal Status*

"To Break Our Chains and Form a Free People":
Race, Nation, and Haiti's Imperial Constitution of 1805
PHILIP KAISARY *71*

Seaman and Citizen: Learning the Law of Citizenship, from Baltimore to Valparaiso
MARTHA S. JONES *89*

PART 3. *Labor and Freedom*

Apprenticeship and Emancipation in the Caribbean: The Seeds of Citizenship
GAD HEUMAN *107*

Who Is Black in a Black Republic? Labor in the Remaking of Black Citizenship in Liberia
CAREE A. BANTON *121*

PART 4. *Race and the Public Sphere*

Race and Belonging in the New American Nation: The Republican Roots of Black Abolitionism
PAUL J. POLGAR *143*

"All the Inhabitants of This America Are Citizens": Imagining Equality, Nation, and Citizenship in an Atlantic Frame
JAMES E. SANDERS *164*

The Racial Terms of Citizenship: Abolition and Its Political Aftermath in Northeastern Brazil
CELSO THOMAS CASTILHO *184*

Contributors *203*

FOREWORD

Nations beyond Nations

JULIE SAVILLE

Dèyè mòn gen mòn.
Beyond mountains there are yet more mountains.

HAITIAN PROVERB

During its increased recognition and ongoing incorporation as an established field of academic inquiry, the framework of the Atlantic world has inspired a rich and burgeoning body of scholarship. Like other productive areas of academic inquiry, the Atlantic world, as a historically varying domain of shifting human experiences, encompasses a range of conceptual approaches, methodologies, and thematic problems. Just a few of its organizing themes are state-to-state diplomatic relationships; webs of long-distance trade, commerce, and consumption; the origins and consequences of Western Europe's imperial colonizations of the Americas; and the politics of diasporic migrations and returns. Although the logics of these central themes conceive the problematics that Atlantic studies should address somewhat differently, all of them make clear that the early modern and modern Atlantic world differed in many respects from the Mediterranean world as examined by Fernand Braudel.[1] The social, economic, and cultural contours of the Atlantic world are distinguished from the sixteenth-century Mediterranean by the former's volatile, often violent colonial encounters, unprecedented penetration of dispersed social organizations by capitalist economic development, transportation of forced labor to far-distant sites to produce key commodities that were processed and consumed elsewhere, and invention and broad dispersal of logics of racial identification.

Much of the work in this expansive field—particularly the scholarship inspired by the explorations of slavery, race, and colonialism opened by W. E. B. Du Bois, C. L. R. James, and Eric Williams—has explored and debated the development, transformations, and consequences of Atlantic slavery and the

slave trade. Reflecting on this current emphasis, historians Whitney Nell Stewart and John Garrison Marks have shaped this volume to bring into view the research agendas that can be enriched by extending investigations to encompass Atlantic slavery's abolitions over the course of the long nineteenth century. An analytical shift that draws slave emancipations more fully into Atlantic studies frameworks recuperates Du Bois's, James's, and Williams's interest in the long-term global effects of slavery, race, and colonization in generating contradictions of modern freedom. This approach is also well suited to capture changes in the historical meanings of nation and citizenship as the abolition of slavery increasingly defined the path to political independence that the new nations in North and South America—though not the slaveholding colonies of the Caribbean—would take.

The circumstances of formerly enslaved, freeborn, and manumitted people of color in the nations that emerged during more than a century of slave emancipations seemed emblematic of the modern meaning of nation that French scholar Ernest Renan described in his well-known essay "What Is a Nation?" (first delivered as an 1882 lecture at the Sorbonne).[2] Renan's classic account pronounced an end to an era in which elements of a shared habitus—dynastic lineages and common language, religion, and territory, as he identified them—served as the wellspring of nation making. Emerging nations in the Americas were culturally, linguistically, and ethnically plural in ways that the old formula was inadequate to describe. Rather than experiences of longtime residence in territories inhabited in common with former owners, formerly enslaved and manumitted people of color had known the unpredictable upheavals of long-distance migrations and multiple relocations—movements often precipitated by the violence of imperial and anticolonial wars. In the place of religions and languages shared by former slaves and former masters, Afro-Atlantic cultural expressions often substituted syncretic religious forms and novel, previously unspoken languages, none of them identical to whatever cultural and linguistic progenitors might be identified in the Old World. Such circumstances, unimagined by Renan as the stuff from which nations were made, lay at the heart of experiences and sensibilities that cultural studies scholar Paul Gilroy has termed a "counter-culture of modernity"—the Black Atlantic as experienced by formerly enslaved and freeborn people of color.[3] In the domains of movement, law, labor, and public life—the themes by which Stewart and Marks have organized these essays—the authors explore how transatlantic circuits of long-distance movement, legal modes of categorization, experiences of labor, and the myriad nonpolitical codes that governed public life conditioned responses to variant forms of exclusionary citizenship. Read together, the essays bring into view

postemancipation tensions of nineteenth-century nationhood that often lent a transregional character to the pursuit of emancipation from slavery.

Explorations of the Atlantic dimensions and consequences of slave emancipations promise to deepen understanding of the practical and symbolic meanings of nationhood—a project launched by Benedict Anderson's widely influential *Imagined Communities*.[4] Around the Atlantic, previously subordinated social groups seized abolition of the slave trade, reports (sometimes misapprehended) of court decisions concerning slavery, accounts of the activities of antislavery groups (also at times misconstrued), and even rumored decrees of government officials (usually exaggerated) as institutional guarantees foretelling the fulfillment of aspirations long subordinated under the weight of slavery's racial hierarchies. The social order envisioned by members of these groups—part prophecy, part experience—amplify Anderson's pioneering insistence on nations as imagined communities, grounded in historically specific cultural practices and modes of social communication rather than the fixed, stable prerequisites whose decline Renan had posited.

The essays in this volume give close attention to the particular geographic, cultural, and historical contexts in which formerly enslaved people and freeborn people of color began to express an abstract sense of peoplehood whose importance to nation making Anderson has identified. In some respects, they began to forge national sentiments from peculiar—or at least unconventional—community identities. Widely dispersed groups of people, few of whom were mutually acquainted, shared visions of freedom more than territorial loyalties, an attachment to liberty more than to patriotism or, indeed, at times, to life, and more of an opposition to direct domination than an affinity for particular governments. In contrast to propertied, often literate enclaves among free people of color, who appealed to imperial and metropolitan statutes to bolster their claims for civic standing, enslaved people drew on a broadly common ethos that expressed itself most fully in the plane of action rather than as legal precedent or philosophy. Enslaved men, women, and children variously made their ways in mass escapes toward third parties—British, American, Spanish, French, or, in later contexts, Yankee, Mexican, or Brazilian armies and territories.

Despite their physical dispersal, as the principal workers in a globalized system of long-distance production and consumption, formerly enslaved people arguably moved toward the prospect of emancipation encased in one of humanity's most highly symbolized, and broadly circulated, deracinated human representations: what Anderson terms the "world-category negro," an identification stripped of references to a particular locale or place.[5] Areas that warrant further study include the implications of Anderson's observation for postemancipation

cultural politics and the evolution of multicultural citizenship, the racialization of national minorities, and comparative racial and ethnic studies of the relationship between postemancipation social communities and the newly national states.

This volume's essays bring into view particular ways in which formerly enslaved people and freeborn people of color drew on historically conditioned sensibilities of abstract peoplehood to give meaning to emancipation. In the shadows of racialized citizenship, they formed new "nations" of religious brotherhoods, fraternal organizations, and public associations, fashioning public displays of cultural claims to membership in communities generated more by a sense of linked fate and common struggles than by identical relationships to state authority. Read together, these essays trace transformations in the experiential worlds of peoples of color, revealing the contours of political landscapes as imagined by communities largely unrecognized in the new national constitutions and state codes that defined more noncitizens than citizens in the emergent states.

The volume's four thematic sections—movement, law, labor, and the public sphere—identify key areas in which the political identities of these resident but unrecognized groups took shape, thereby demarcating key moments in the emergence of Afro-Atlantic latent citizens as political subjects. At the outset of an era of revolutions in which slavery was illegal in no Atlantic polity, imperial wars and armed conflict created openings in which refugees from slavery found it was easier to change the scale and direction of their movements than to alter the power relations that sparked their journeys and defined their paths toward unknowable outcomes and destinations. Many slaves nevertheless followed with great interest reported changes in the legal recognition of slavery, charting individual and collective routes of escape to a new calculus of free soil. Free people of color who left settled, often urban communities at times benefited from literacy and prior familiarity with administrative and professional bureaucracies that, with persuasion or for a fee, might provide documentation that could legitimate travel. The successful journeys of enslaved people, especially refugees leaving plantation zones, relied on social learning along the way and no small bit of negotiation and luck. Travelers often fled toward a possible world rather than any known destination. However varied their circumstances and whether they traveled alone or in the continuous company of family and kin, they moved in search of new conditions of existence. Therefore, whatever the goals, aims, and strategies of their journeys, they pursued social and political conventions by which a change of place might become a change in circumstance. In an era where the idea of the nation as primary guarantor of

rights was slowly emerging, maritime workers seem more than any other group of Afro-Atlantic workers to have enjoyed documented identification of a relationship to state authority. But not even seamen's protection papers fulfilled stable, portable personal relationships to state citizenship.

Indeed, it is difficult to identify a domain of social life in which racial identifications, which proliferated in law in the era of slavery's abolition, did not compromise emancipation's promise. Remunerated labor proved an ideological field as prone to alienation as slavery. At the same time, the centrality of work to emancipated people's experiences helped to constitute labor as a domain in which rural residents led labor-centered demands for justice, particularly during emancipation's first generations. Self-conscious organizations took work claims into public spaces with stunning intensity. Nonetheless, the public sphere, idealized in liberal imaginations as a space of consensual social relations premised on equality, could also easily legitimate socially approved hierarchies of clientage and racial subordination, even in staged interracial interactions. Some of the strongest illustrations of the impact of racial hierarchy may well lie in the relatively understudied comparative examinations of postemancipation public life. The essays here call attention to the question of how to decode and compare the celebratory cross-racial festivals of abolition in some regions of Colombia and Brazil with conventions of crowd behavior in the postemancipation U.S. plantation zones, where, outside of a brief period in a few urban centers, staged celebrations of emancipation between ex-masters and former slaves would have been unthinkable.[6]

The capacity of public rites to stage the display of new rights seems in some ways akin to the faith in the power of legal categories to transform public life. The scripted festivals of emancipation performed in postabolition Recife certainly rehearsed codes of social interaction as novel as the statutes of Haiti's 1805 constitution, which briefly conjured a new form of citizenship grounded in a nonessentialized, universal Afro-Atlantic blackness. Emancipation's festivals of freedom and new constitutions at times appealed to the transformative capacities of two ostensibly distinct domains of law and public spectacle that momentarily illustrated what Étienne Balibar has termed citizenship's "hyperbolic proposition."[7] Deeds and words reach beyond their immediate scripts.

Between 1770 and 1850, then, state-sponsored abolition produced more noncitizens than citizens. Indeed, it is likely that more people were enslaved during this era than were declared free. At the same time, upheavals of an era of volatile, contradictory emancipations from slavery contributed to the paradox of transregional, cross-imperial quests among the hemisphere's dispersed groups of free people of color to anchor varying claims to state-mediated citi-

zenship. From their perspectives, transnational and national spaces constituted reciprocal, interconnected networks of action and communication rather than politically distinct social spheres. Such networks of action and communication can be aptly described by adapting a Haitian proverb: "Behind nations there are more nations." A multiethnic, pluralist nationhood crept onto the horizon of possibility, though it remains unrealized more than two centuries later.

NOTES

1. Fernand Braudel, *The Mediterranean and the Mediterranean World in the Age of Philip II*, 2 vols., trans. Siân Reynolds (New York: Harper & Row, 1972). John Thornton called attention to some contrasts in *Africa and Africans in the Making of the Atlantic World* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998).

2. An English translation of Renan's essay appears in Geoff Eley and Ronald Grigor Suny, *Becoming National: A Reader* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996), 41–55.

3. Paul Gilroy, *The Black Atlantic: Modernity and Double Consciousness* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1993), 1–41.

4. Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (New York: Verso, 1983).

5. Ibid., 122–23.

6. In addition to Castilho, this volume, see Jason P. McGraw, *The Work of Recognition: Caribbean Colombia and the Postemancipation Struggle for Citizenship* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2014).

7. This reading of Balibar is explored in Laurent Dubois, *A Colony of Citizens: Revolution and Slave Emancipation in the French Caribbean, 1787–1804* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2012). See also Étienne Balibar, "Citizen Subject," in *Who Comes after the Subject?*, ed. Eduardo Cadava, Peter Connor, and Jean-Luc Nancy (London: Routledge, 1991), 33–57; Étienne Balibar, "Antinomies of Citizenship," *Journal of Romance Studies* 10, no. 2 (Summer 2010): 1–20.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We express our deep gratitude to the numerous individuals and institutions who made this anthology possible. This volume stems from a symposium held at Rice University in the spring of 2012, with the generous support of Rice University's History Department, College of Arts and Sciences, Humanities Research Center, and Graduate Student Association. James Sidbury, Caleb McDaniel, Alida Metcalf, and Lora Wildenthal provided invaluable advice along the way. Coursework and exams with these exceptional scholars moved us to put together the symposium and this anthology. The History Department at Rice and the graduate students therein have developed a culture that allows projects like this one to flourish, and we were fortunate to have great examples to follow and to receive strong support. In particular, an earlier symposium organized by then-graduate students Ben Wright and Zachary Dresser provided us with a model and made it easier to make the case that this was something graduate students could and should be doing.

We are extremely grateful for the time, effort, and collegiality of those who participated in this project. The symposium elicited enlightening and intriguing discussions that made clear the necessity of this volume. We thank all of the participants in the original symposium, including those whose contributions we were not able to include in this anthology: Franz Hensel-Riveros, Natasha Lightfoot, Edward Moloy, K. Aaron Oosterhout, Rachel Purvis, Beverly C. Tomek, and Charlton Yingling. We also thank the individuals who contributed to or participated in the symposium in other ways: Laura Rosanne Adderley, Matthew Clavin, Jack P. Greene, Philip A. Howard, Violet M. Johnson, and Nikki Taylor, as well as Rice graduate students Ashley Evelyn, Biko Gray, D. Andrew Johnson, Cara Rogers, W. E. Skidmore II, and others. Although this volume has grown, developed, and changed in major ways since the initial symposium, that weekend's discussions sparked the creation of this volume.

We also thank the contributors to this volume. These outstanding scholars took a leap of faith in entrusting their scholarly work to then-advanced graduate students and first-time volume editors. We are grateful for their patience. We extend an additional thank-you to Julie Saville, an incredible scholar who reworked her keynote address as the foreword. She is one of the kindest and most generous people with whom we have had the privilege to work. We thank Race in the Atlantic World, 1700–1900 series editors Richard S. Newman, Patrick Rael, and Manisha Sinha, as well as the members of the editorial advisory board, for selecting this anthology to appear alongside so many phenomenal works of scholarship. Walter Biggins and the other editors at University of Georgia Press provided invaluable assistance and advice throughout this process.

Whitney thanks Ben for his encouragement, editorial eye, and affection. John thanks his wife, Caroline, for her unending support and encouragement.

Race and Nation in
the Age of Emancipations

This page intentionally left blank

Introduction

WHITNEY NELL STEWART AND
JOHN GARRISON MARKS

Benedict Anderson famously described the nation as an imagined community.[1] Yet in the nineteenth-century Atlantic world, the way these communities were imagined and reimagined by various groups represented perhaps the century's most pressing political and cultural question. As various groups sought to code nation and citizenship as white, they confronted communities that were strikingly diverse.[2] The problem of defining citizenship for such populations—multireligious, multiethnic, multiracial—was a global one, bound up in myriad ways with the effort to overthrow colonial rule.[3] Yet the nations of the Atlantic world felt these issues particularly acutely during the nineteenth century, as societies built on African slavery struggled to reconcile the boundaries of citizenship with concepts of racial difference in the wake of emancipation. Throughout this fraught process, people of African descent both free and enslaved played an active role in shaping conceptions of national belonging and in defining the meaning of citizenship.

Throughout the nineteenth-century Atlantic, white authorities in colonial states and independent nations began to confront questions about how to define citizenship amid the wave of emancipation made possible by the Age of Revolutions and a growing international antislavery movement. Often excluded from national belonging based on racial difference, men and women of African descent capitalized on this Atlantic moment to make their voices heard and to weigh in on this crucial question. Throughout this era, people of African descent contributed in fundamental ways to debates regarding how to define citizenship, transforming notions of national belonging at a crucial juncture in the history of the modern world. Though the specifics of their expectations for citizenship and their success in seeing those expectations realized depended on the unique circumstances of each particular place and time, viewing this collective activity from an Atlantic perspective reveals the many ways that people of

African descent used the uncertainties and possibilities of emancipation to stake claims to citizenship, national belonging, and equality, profoundly altering the contours of communities, nations, and the Atlantic world.

As the Atlantic world has grown as both a field and a historical perspective, historians have increasingly focused on the many links between the peoples of the Atlantic basin and the structures that bound them together. Capitalism, slavery, and race itself all formed and transformed within the crucible of the Atlantic world, often with tragic consequences for people of African descent.[4] While seminal works by C. L. R. James and Eric Williams and more recent works by Cedric Robinson, Paul Gilroy, and others have examined the relationship of slavery and capitalism, modes of resistance among African-descended people, and the development of black diasporic cultures in the Atlantic, these questions continue to drive the work of contemporary scholars.[5] Indeed, the renewed scholarly interest in exploring the centrality of racial slavery to the development of global capitalism—and the efforts of African-descended people to resist the oppression of that system—has represented some of the most exciting and most robust recent scholarship on the Atlantic world.[6] While questions about racial capitalism and modes of resistance feature prominently in recent studies of the Black Atlantic, this anthology focuses on equally important though less frequently studied questions about race, citizenship, and national belonging. This volume's broad approach allows us to see clearly the ways the Atlantic world both produced systems that oppressed people of African descent and facilitated the development of the cultural and intellectual tools that allowed them to challenge white colonial and national authorities, thereby staking claims to belonging.

While broad in approach, this volume's essays are also rooted in the particular. Much of the scholarship on the Atlantic world has emphasized the ways people and ideas crossed borders both real and imagined, yet the worlds of many people of African descent remained profoundly local. The eleven essays presented here examine the complex and shifting concept of race, arguing that the Age of Emancipations represented a crucial moment in which people of African descent transformed the meaning of citizenship and national belonging. Each essay focuses on a distinct locale and community—from Canada to Brazil to Liberia and beyond—while both individually and collectively reflecting the Atlantic nature of emancipation. Indeed, placing local detail within broader imperial and national contexts has been essential to understanding variations in the institution of slavery, the definitions of race, and the worlds of African-descended people. Just as slavery differed on the sugar plantations of Jamaica, the urban bustle of Rio de Janeiro, and the swamps of the southern

United States, black freedom varied immensely based on these local, national, and imperial contexts. Yet by viewing the worlds of Africans and their descendants through the prism of the Atlantic world, this volume demonstrates that African-descended people throughout the region collectively seized on the Age of Emancipations to stake claims to a new place within the nation via strategies, opportunities, and successes that reflected local particularities.

To evaluate the role and impact of African-descended people in shaping ideas about race and nation in the Atlantic world, this volume focuses on a few major questions. What did nation and citizenship mean to these people? How did they challenge white authorities and demand that whites recognize blacks' visions for citizenship and their place within the nation? In what ways did differences in legal regimes, religious institutions, state bureaucracies, and cultural values influence these efforts?[7] The scholarship in this volume engages these broad questions from a perspective that allows us to consider more fully the shifting relationship between race and nation over the long nineteenth century. The anthology is divided into sections on mobility, law, labor, and the public sphere, four of the many paradigms that have guided studies of race, slavery, and freedom in the Atlantic world. Focusing on these themes leaves some categories unexplored—perhaps most obviously the role of gender—but allows the volume to address some of the central questions about race and nation in the nineteenth-century Atlantic world.[8]

One of the defining characteristics of Atlantic world history has been its emphasis on networks and movement—links between people, places, empires, and ideas. By emphasizing the central role of Africans and their descendants in the development of systems of trade, exchange, and migration as well as the importance of the circulation of ideas, goods, and people, scholarship in this field has stressed the centrality of movement to the formation of black culture and identity and of the Atlantic world itself.[9] Yet even as these connections stretched within and across colonial empires and national borders, African-descended people often interpreted Atlantic lessons within a national framework. And the circulation involved not simply goods and ideas but also free and enslaved people of African descent. The essays in Part I explore how people of African descent used movement to find and declare their national place. The right to move when and where one wanted was often withheld from people of African descent, both enslaved and free, but they nevertheless used their feet to challenge and transform notions of citizenship and national belonging. And as they moved, they staked claims to a variety of different local, national, and diasporic identities, challenging white authorities to reconsider the place and role of people of color within the nation.

Matthew Spooner argues that mobility is central to understanding black southerners in revolutionary America, as enslaved people moved across borders, boundaries, and oceans to seek freedom in the moments of possibility presented by the American war for independence. Andrew N. Wegmann approaches questions about mobility through the lens of migration, examining how the internal racial politics and social mores of Louisiana and Virginia influenced free people of color's involvement with or rejection of the Liberian colonization movement. Ikuko Asaka identifies how fugitive slaves from the United States who fled to Canada employed conceptions of nationhood and politics to craft identities as political exiles and refugees. Despite Canada's vigorous anti-black climate, these émigrés equated their escape from the U.S. Slave Power with the experiences of refugees from Europe's 1848 revolutions, revealing the heterogeneous concepts of the nation operative in the Atlantic world. For Africans and their descendants, movement, mobility, and migration not only crucially informed their understanding of the world and themselves but functioned as an indispensable tool for challenging white elites to recognize and respect African-descended people's claims to freedom and citizenship.

While mobility has been central to questions pertaining to race in the Atlantic world, scholars have also long examined the intertwining of legal and racial systems. Since the publication of Frank Tannenbaum's *Slave and Citizen* (1946), scholars of the Americas and Atlantic world—particularly those working from a comparative perspective—have examined how the law has shaped the social and cultural worlds of African-descended people.[10] More recently, scholars have begun fervently reevaluating the scholarship on race, law, and citizenship.[11] By more closely analyzing not just the text of law but the ways groups and individuals interpreted those laws in practice, historians reveal how exposure to the intellectual and cultural currents of the Atlantic world transformed understandings and uses of the law, particularly for people of African descent.[12]

The essays in Part 2 reveal a clearer sense of the ways race, nationality, law, and freedom transformed and how Atlantic discourses gained saliency in various local contexts. Analyzing Haiti's "radical constitutionalism" in the wake of revolution there, Philip Kaisary explores how Haitians legally codified their visions of freedom. As he argues, the Haitian constitution is the only such document from this era that ensures unconditional freedom and citizenship. Martha S. Jones uses the experiences of George Hackett, a free black sailor and steward, to explore how the policies and procedures of a naval vessel and legal developments elsewhere in the Americas created a complex nexus between race, law, and citizenship that was carried back to the United States. These essays reveal that in courthouses, constitutional conventions, and beyond, people of Af-

rican descent recognized the law's potential to facilitate negotiations for rights and freedom and often used intellectual currents to push for national-level changes. Emancipation constituted a moment of opportunity in which people of color could redefine the rights of citizenship, achieve guarantees of freedom, and force states to recognize those rights and guarantees.

Perhaps the most studied aspect of postemancipation societies has been labor, as scholars explore the many transformations and continuities in that arena during the transition from slavery to freedom. Labor has constituted one of the central themes of studies of race and slavery in the United States, Latin America, the Caribbean, and West Africa. Pathbreaking work by historians Thomas C. Holt, Julie Saville, Rebecca J. Scott, and others has emphasized the centrality of labor to conflicts between blacks and whites over the nature of emancipation and the meaning of freedom and citizenship.[13] More recent work has continued to emphasize the central role of labor in the lives of African-descended people in a variety of geographic and cultural contexts, particularly in staking claims to national belonging.[14]

The essays in Part 3 reflect and contribute to this conversation about race, labor, and emancipation, investigating how labor informed conceptions of citizenship. Gad Heuman deftly explores how former slaves in the British Caribbean responded to the apprenticeship system, revealing how they imagined freedom as well as their place in local and imperial communities. By rejecting the terms of both emancipation and apprenticeship, former slaves forced colonial authorities to recognize black expectations for freedom. Caree A. Banton examines how labor informed conceptions of potential citizens after Liberia's primary stream of migrants shifted from African Americans to Barbadians following the U.S. Civil War. Banton argues that Barbadians' diasporic experience and specific labor skills—in contrast with enslaved Africans liberated from Atlantic slave ships and indigenous West Africans—allowed African American leaders in Liberia to view Barbadian migrants as potential citizens in a modern nation. Banton and Heuman reveal labor's crucial role in the lives of African-descended people, particularly as they sought to re-create their worlds after emancipation. While slavery was of course more than just a labor system, formerly enslaved laborers recognized that whites' need for workers offered a significant bargaining chip and did not hesitate to use it.

Scholars also have often looked at the ways African-descended people used the public sphere to stake claims to citizenship. As freedom opened new opportunities to participation in public life, people of African descent organized voluntary associations; published books, essays, and newspapers; and participated in marches, parades, and other activities designed to demonstrate their fitness

for a place as national citizens.[15] The essays in Part 4 contribute to this growing body of literature, examining how people of African descent from New York City to Popayán to Recife used the public sphere to transform the meaning of citizenship and the relationship between race and nation. Paul J. Polgar looks at how free people of color in Philadelphia, New York, and elsewhere in the early national U.S. North used the public sphere to develop a unique brand of antislavery activism and reform through an emphasis on personal and moral uplift. Through their claims to respectability, free black northerners attempted to demonstrate that African Americans could embody the values of republicanism and that enslaved people could survive and thrive in freedom. James E. Sanders analyzes how claims to modernity rang out in the public spheres of both Mexico and Colombia as republican leaders trumpeted the equality of the new nations, highlighting the contrast with North American racism and European monarchy. Sanders examines how subaltern people pressed their claims of belonging and citizenship in these new nations, publicly forcing leaders to live up to their boasts about racial equality and their ideas about the modern nation. Celso Thomas Castilho tackles the public discourse regarding abolition, revealing the complex relationship between "African" identity, abolition ceremonies, and political belonging in Brazil in the contentious years of 1888 and 1889. Castilho argues that private associational activity could spur civic action, as public demonstrations by Brazilian abolition associations allowed freedpeople to stake their claims at part of the national community.

The shifting relationship between race and nation represented one of the most pressing political questions of the nineteenth century. While the individual essays in this volume are replete with the kind of fine-grained detail that is possible only through a sharp focus on specific times and places, they combine to reveal that the process of reconciling racial difference with the rights of citizenship occurred both within and across national boundaries. By reincorporating the role of the nation in the lives of ordinary people while maintaining a broader Atlantic perspective, this volume offers scholars a way to reevaluate the meanings of freedom, emancipation, nation, and citizenship in the nineteenth-century Atlantic world.

NOTES

1. Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, rev. ed. (New York: Verso, 2006).

2. Aimé Césaire describes the coding of the categories *man* and *nation* as white in *Discourse on Colonialism*, trans. Joan Pinkham (1972; New York: Monthly Review Press,

2000). The whitening of nation and citizenship has been explored recently by Robert G. Parkinson, *The Common Cause: Creating Race and Nation in the American Revolution* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2016). For the relationship between race and nation in various Latin American contexts, see Nancy P. Appelbaum, Anne S. Macpherson, and Karin Alejandra Rosemblatt, eds., *Race and Nation in Modern Latin America* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2007).

3. Edward J. Blum, *Reforging the White Republic: Race, Religion, and American Nationalism, 1865–1898* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2007); Michelle U. Campos, *Ottoman Brothers: Muslims, Christians, and Jews in Early Twentieth-Century Palestine* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2010); Bruce Clark, *Twice a Stranger: How Mass Expulsion Forged Modern Greece and Turkey* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2009); Nicholas B. Dirks, *Castes of Mind: Colonialism and the Making of Modern India* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001); Ussama Makdisi, *The Culture of Sectarianism: Community, History, and Violence in Nineteenth-Century Ottoman Lebanon* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000); Aamir Mufti, *Enlightenment in the Colony: The Jewish Question and the Crisis of Postcolonial Culture* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2007).

4. The work of David Brion Davis has been central to this historiography, including *The Problem of Slavery in the Age of Revolution* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1975); *Inhuman Bondage: The Rise and Fall of Slavery in the New World* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006); and *The Problem of Slavery in the Age of Emancipation* (New York: Knopf, 2014). See also Joyce Chaplin, "Race," in *The British Atlantic World, 1500–1800*, ed. David Armitage and Michael J. Braddick (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009).

5. C. L. R. James, *The Black Jacobins: Toussaint L'Ouverture and the San Domingo Revolution* (London: Secker & Warburg, 1938); Eric Williams, *Capitalism and Slavery* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1944); Paul Gilroy, *The Black Atlantic: Modernity and Double Consciousness* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1993); Cedric Robinson, *Black Marxism: The Making of the Black Radical Tradition* (1983; Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2000).

6. See, for example, Edward E. Baptist, *The Half Has Never Been Told: Slavery and the Making of American Capitalism* (New York: Basic, 2014); Sven Beckert, *Empire of Cotton: A Global History* (New York: Vintage, 2015); Sven Beckert and Seth Rockman, eds., *Slavery's Capitalism: A New History of American Economic Development* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2016); Walter Johnson, *River of Dark Dreams: Slavery and Empire in the Cotton Kingdom* (Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2013). Robinson's pathbreaking work, especially *Black Marxism*, has substantially influenced these recent works.

7. The meanings and boundaries of freedom and its attendant rights were not formed in isolation but were developed through negotiations between black and white. Historians who have emphasized this negotiation include Kim D. Butler, *Freedoms Given, Freedoms Won: Afro-Brazilians in Post-Abolition São Paulo and Salvador* (New Brunswick:

Rutgers University Press, 1998); Frederick Cooper, Thomas C. Holt, and Rebecca J. Scott, *Beyond Slavery: Explorations of Race, Labor, and Citizenship in Postemancipation Societies* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2000); Matt D. Childs, *The 1812 Aponte Rebellion in Cuba and the Struggle against Atlantic Slavery* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2006); Laurent Dubois, *A Colony of Citizens: Revolution and Slave Emancipation in the French Caribbean, 1787–1804* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2004); Ada Ferrer, *Freedom's Mirror: Cuba and Haiti in the Age of Revolution* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2014); Aline Helg, *Liberty and Equality in Caribbean Colombia, 1770–1835* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2004).

8. The scholarship on gender and race in the Atlantic world is vibrant and vital, including but certainly not limited to the work of Jennifer L. Morgan, Marisa J. Fuentes, Sowande' M. Mustakeem, and Saidiya Hartman. See Jennifer L. Morgan, *Laboring Women: Reproduction and Gender in New World Slavery* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2011); Marisa J. Fuentes, *Dispossessed Lives: Enslaved Women, Violence, and the Archive* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2016); Sowande' M. Mustakeem, *Slavery at Sea: Terror, Sex, and Sickness in the Middle Passage* (Champaign: University of Illinois Press, 2016); Saidiya Hartman, *Lose Your Mother: A Journey along the Atlantic Slave Route* (New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux, 2007). The editors hope that others will continue to examine how gender shaped African-descended peoples' pursuit of nation and citizenship.

9. See R. J. M. Blackett, *Building an Antislavery Wall: Black Americans in the Atlantic Abolitionist Movement, 1830–1860* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2002); James Sidbury, *Becoming African in America: Race and Nation in the Early Black Atlantic* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2009); James H. Sweet, *Recreating Africa: Culture, Kinship, and Religion in the African-Portuguese World, 1441–1770* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2003); John K. Thornton, *Africa and Africans and the Making of the Atlantic World, 1400–1800* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998).

10. Frank Tannenbaum, *Slave and Citizen: The Negro in the Americas* (New York: Knopf, 1946). See Gilberto Freyre, *Brazil: An Interpretation* (New York: Knopf, 1951); Carl Degler, *Neither Black nor White: Slavery and Race Relations in Brazil and the United States* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1986); Herbert Klein, *Slavery in the Americas: A Comparative Study of Virginia and Cuba*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010).

11. See Lauren Benton, *Law and Colonial Cultures: Legal Regimes in World History, 1400–1900* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2001); Alejandro de la Fuente, "Slave Law and Claims-Making in Cuba: The Tannenbaum Debate Revisited," *Law and History Review* 22, no. 2 (Summer 2004): 339–69; Alejandro de la Fuente, "From Slaves to Citizens? Tannenbaum and the Debates on Slavery, Emancipation, and Race Relations in Latin America," *International Labor and Working-Class History* 77, no. 1 (Spring 2010): 154–73; Alejandro de la Fuente and Ariela Gross, "Comparative Studies

of Law, Slavery, and Race in the Americas," *Annual Review of Law and Social Science* 6 (2010): 469–85; Rebecca J. Scott, "Paper Thin: Freedom and Re-Enslavement in the Diaspora of the Haitian Revolution," *Law and History Review* 29, no. 4 (November 2011): 1061–87.

12. See Melvin Patrick Ely, *Israel on the Appomattox: A Southern Experiment in Black Freedom from the 1790s through the Civil War* (New York: Vintage, 2005); Kirt von Daacke, *Freedom Has a Face: Race, Identity, and Community in Jefferson's Virginia* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2012).

13. See Thomas C. Holt, *Problem of Freedom: Race, Labor, and Politics in Jamaica and Britain, 1832–1938* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1991); Julie Saville, *The Work of Reconstruction: From Slave to Wage Laborer in South Carolina, 1860–1870* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996); Rebecca J. Scott, *Slave Emancipation in Cuba: The Transition to Free Labor, 1860–1899* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2000).

14. See William Dusinberre, *Them Dark Days: Slavery in the American Rice Swamps* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2000); Natasha J. Lightfoot, *Troubling Freedom: Antigua and the Aftermath of British Emancipation* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2015); Jason P. McGraw, *The Work of Recognition: Caribbean Colombia and the Postemancipation Struggle for Citizenship* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2014); Seth Rockman, *Scraping By: Wage Labor, Slavery, and Survival in Early Baltimore* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2009); Rebecca J. Scott, *Degrees of Freedom: Louisiana and Cuba after Slavery* (Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2005).

15. See Butler, *Freedoms Given, Freedoms Won*; Childs, *1812 Aponte Rebellion*; John Garrison Marks, "Race and Freedom in the African Americas: Free People of Color and Social Mobility in Cartagena and Charleston" (PhD diss., Rice University, 2016); Patrick Rael, *Black Identity and Black Protest in the Antebellum North* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2002); Michele Reid-Vazquez, *The Year of the Lash: Free People of Color in Cuba and the Nineteenth-Century Atlantic World* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2011).

This page intentionally left blank

PART I

Mobility and Migration

This page intentionally left blank

Freedom, Reenslavement, and Movement in the Revolutionary South

MATTHEW SPOONER

The American Revolution meant more and appeared to offer more to the nearly half million black men and women who lived and labored below Mason and Dixon's line than it did for any other group of Americans. During the first days of the Stamp Act debates, black men and women in Charleston, South Carolina, took to their city's streets, staking the strongest claim to the revolution's promise with chants of "Liberty!"[1] In the decade before Lexington and Concord, slaves gathered on plantations to organize flight and armed resistance: those on one Virginia plantation formally elected leaders "to conduct them when the English troops should arrive."[2] Black Americans appeared before royal governors and military officers, pledging support in exchange for freedom.[3] And when the full force of war moved south, dividing white southerners and disrupting the social order that buttressed slaveholder authority, slaves asserted their claim to the revolution's principle of liberty with their voices, their arms, and their feet. By the end of the conflict in 1783, tens of thousands of slaves from the southern states had departed America's shores to forge new lives and new communities in places as far-flung as Nova Scotia, England, and Sierra Leone.[4]

This collective story of black men and women seizing the opportunities presented by war to obtain their freedom abroad or within the young United States remains the dominant historical narrative of black southerners' experience during the revolutionary era.[5] For commendable reasons, historians of the wartime South focus on men and women such as Boston King and Thomas Peters who gained their freedom through trial and heroism. Historians of the early national South tend to focus on those enslaved men and women who escaped slavery through their own actions or through manumission, while historians who focus on slaves' experience of the War of Independence similarly tend to work from a narrative of the revolution as a moment of unprecedented

resistance and opportunity.[6] Still others have written on the abolition of slavery in the North or have drawn a direct line from the ideology of the American Revolution to the eventual eradication of American slavery after the Civil War.[7] Yet although these stories continue to frame our understanding of black southerners' experience of the revolution, and although the revolution is most often portrayed as an emancipatory moment, however fleeting, King, Peters, and others like them account for only a small fraction of the hundreds of thousands of black men and women touched by America's struggle for independence.[8]

The overwhelming majority of black southerners ended the revolutionary era as slaves: many thousands moved from slavery to freedom and then back into slavery. Rather than frame the American Revolution as an event that either strengthened slavery or marked slavery's eventual demise (it did both), this essay tells a narrative of black Americans' revolutionary experience as something more representative and ultimately far more tragic. The chaos of the revolutionary conflict allowed enslaved men and women an unprecedented degree of movement and as a result blurred the line between slavery and freedom, with deeply important consequences for the southern societies that emerged from the period.[9] Some enslaved men and women passed through this line and remained free, and many black Americans found in the revolution political, social, and economic gains. Yet the forces that allowed the creation of the American nation and lessened the demarcation between slavery and freedom led most black men and women to experience the period as a time of tremendous hardship, of suffering as much as opportunity, of fighting to maintain the gains for which they had fought in the spaces opened by the revolution.

The stories of these southerners—as inspiring, heartbreaking, and important to this nation's development as the stories of the relative few who gained freedom—remain largely overlooked. They have been hidden by our collective tendency to see continuity instead of rupture in the practice of slaveholding during the transition from the early national period and by our desire to recover that which was good and laudable from all that was contradictory about the revolution and its ideals. Yet southerners constructed a new society from the ashes of war through the labor of men and women who ended the period enslaved, and their stories enable us to best see how the experiences of the revolution shaped the contours of southern life in the new nation. Even if black southerners' commitments during the War of Independence lay, in historian Benjamin Quarles's words, "not to a place, nor to a people," their struggles to maintain the spaces opened by the blurring of the line between slavery and freedom helped to define the contours of later debates over race and belonging in the early republic.[10] More than anything, black southerners' capacity to

move across space and between slavery and freedom during the war pushed the new state governments to develop more restrictive definitions of race and citizenship. And although the enslaved people discussed in this essay were far more concerned with maintaining familial connections and personal gains than with debates over identity and nationhood, their efforts and the reactions they provoked shaped the structure of postwar slavery and of the generations of men and women who fought to end it.

For all that was beautiful about the American Revolution and its ideas, the war to secure independence was often a messy and brutal affair. Particularly in the southern states, patriot leaders struggled to control a disaffected population of loyalists and slaves and to supply a war against the world's largest army from within an export-based economy.[11] Although the war was hardly pleasant in New York and Massachusetts, after the 1778 British invasion of Georgia, the pressure of maintaining control and raising men and materiel turned the situation in the South into something more savage and ultimately more revolutionary. With the American army and the bulk of British forces contained along the coast, neither could prevent the countryside from erupting into a chaotic and full-scale civil war. American general Nathanael Greene witnessed this escalation in 1781, describing "such scenes of desolation, bloodshed and deliberate murder I never was a witness to before! . . . For the want of civil government the bands of society are totally disunited, and the people . . . have become perfectly savage."[12] Each side burned plantations, sometimes repeatedly. Neighbors were known to run one another through with swords; hangings, extralegal murders, and other forms of vigilantism also became frequent.[13] Tens of thousands of slaves fled their homes, while Indians and loyalist partisans transformed the southern interior into a fractured, bloody patchwork.[14]

These burning plantations and battling armies, the fleeing peoples and plundering partisans, and all of the ideological and material strains of the revolution in the South created fleeting spaces in which restrictions on movement and activity among slaves allowed shades of freedom to become fluid. The conflict provided some enslaved men and women with at least temporary autonomy, whether as freedpeople, as maroons, or as slaves who moved about as if free.[15] Yet the liminal spaces created by the chaos and fighting could just as often prove limiting and disrupting. The war intensified the interstate slave trade that had begun with the expansion of white settlement into the southern backcountry in the 1750s; by the end of the revolutionary era, tens of thousands of slaves were forced to leave their homes in coffles headed south and west.[16] And throughout the revolutionary era, black southerners' increased movement between slavery and freedom, between plantations, and between town and country sparked a

flurry of slave conspiracies, real or imagined. As a result, the capacity of enslaved and free black southerners for movement, in both a real and abstract sense, became the most clearly contested site of struggle for black and white southerners in the early republic.

From the beginning of the conflict, the breakdown of oversight and state authority presented enslaved men and women with increased opportunities to run away, and slaves used divisions among the ruling population as opportunities for temporary or permanent freedom. The extent of disorder and infighting among southern Whigs and loyalists provided opportunity that would be unmatched until the Civil War era. By and large, most slaves who absconded during the War of Independence did so individually or en masse from neighboring plantations, a fact that suggests the pull of family ties in determining whether a given slave attempted to run to British lines. In Virginia, those planters who lost slaves tended to lose them in large groups, both at the beginning and end of the war. Slaveholders attempted to prevent escape, and the daily struggle over the movement of slaves was a highly localized and personal conflict.

Individual planters took special care to monitor their slaves, and the fact that slaves appear to have been more likely to desert larger plantations suggests the importance of planters' steps to closely monitor their slaves: smaller slaveholders found it easier to restrict slaves' movement and assemblage.[17] In 1774, Richard Bennehan, scion of the wealthiest family in antebellum North Carolina, heard that the governor of Virginia had offered freedom to the slaves of rebels. Bennehan responded by writing to the manager of his estate, "It is said the Negroes have some thoughts of freedom. Pray make Scrub sleep in the house every night and that the overseer keep in Tom," presumably to limit their opportunity for plotting or escape.[18] Slaveholders also sought to limit the most common avenues of escape, with Georgia planter and politician Edward Telfair requesting in 1776 that his overseer provide "a guard over the row gallies . . . also, that [the] negro pilots be taken up and confined, and that some guard boat be stationed in Savannah River to prevent negroes from going down to Cockspur." Telfair also ordered his overseer "to cause all the negro pilots belonging to him to be confined in some secure place."[19] Slaveholders understood as well the importance of kinship in facilitating or inhibiting slaves' decision to escape, and planters such as Georgia's Lachlan McIntosh made sure to separate slave men from women at night.[20]

For their part, state and local authorities worked to restrict the movement of slaves on a wider scale by increasing patrols and active militia. In particular, states devoted a significant portion of their limited resources to keeping slaves away from waterways, which provided the swiftest means of reaching British

lines. State and local officials specifically instructed patrols to watch rivers and the coastline. Legislatures in Georgia, Virginia, and South Carolina passed laws barring any black man from operating a boat or canoe without a white man present despite a long history of solo black pilots running cargo downriver and within harbors. Given the well-known tendency of militiamen to neglect patrol duty, by 1777 every state had also imposed heavy fines on commanders who missed patrol watch, and commanders received explicit orders and monetary incentives to apprehend slaves found out at night or "alone or in groups upon the roads of the country."[21] Following the fall of Charleston and Savannah and the scattering of state legislatures in 1779 and 1780, however, Whig leaders found their capacity to directly restrict slave movement reduced to almost nothing outside of areas controlled by the American army. By the end of the war, states could do little but encourage or tacitly allow local militia or armed bands to summarily shoot slaves found off plantation past curfew, often dismissing resulting suits from the owner of a murdered or formally executed slave, actions that in themselves encouraged the vigilantism that became widespread during the later years of the revolution.[22]

Despite these increased efforts by both state officials and slaveholders, the strains of controlling and containing multiple combating populations continued to open the space between slavery and freedom and allowed increasing numbers of black men and women greater self-determination and ease of movement, even if they never left their homes. Although fleeing planters and overseers generally tried to carry away what slaves they could, the haste of flight and the unwillingness of slaves to depart meant that many enslaved communities operated independently for extended periods during the war. Some planters left behind drivers or elderly slaves to tend stock or even try to raise crops.[23] More often, and especially in lowcountry areas where the black population was densest and the fighting was frequent and fierce, slaves tended to themselves for weeks, months, and occasionally years. For some, this meant growing small amounts of food and remaining at home: the enslaved laborers belonging to a Georgia man named Cotter were found "living on some potatos and small amount of forage, they look half dead and are intirely in want of clotheing."[24] In other cases, small groups of slaves took advantage of the chaos of war and formed bands or communities, with varying degrees of success and organization. Dick, a man owned by Robert Carter, led "33 other slaves" to run away and hide in Virginia's Tidewater swamps in the summer of 1781: in response, when Dick was apprehended, Carter ordered the man sold "for dear skins."[25] Although maroons often stole from nearby plantations, not hesitating to use violence when needed, they also attempted to develop self-sufficient communi-

ties, building small huts and harvesting crops on patches of dry land in swamps or on the sides of hills or mountains and sometimes sustaining themselves for years amid the disorders of war and reconstruction.[26]

But the forces of revolution cut both ways, especially for black southerners, and localized independence during the war came at a steep price: the same wartime conditions that allowed slaves freedom from white oversight also produced immense suffering. Black men and women were universally the last to receive a share of the South's dwindling supply of food and other essentials. Planters turned tobacco fields to corn and potatoes to feed both white citizens and slaves, and throughout the war slaves lacked adequate clothing. Josiah Smith, a merchant who managed a rice plantation in South Carolina, complained repeatedly to his employer and to other merchants that he was unable to obtain winter clothing for his slaves for several years, "and the miserable wretches seem close to wasting away."[27] Slaves on other plantations went without new shoes for years even as their owners sought to increase output to take advantage of hefty profits to be made from supplying foodstuffs and other goods during the war.[28]

The same breakdown of authority that allowed autonomy and at least limited mobility for some slaves led to the forced movement of thousands of others. Roving bands of partisans and soldiers engaged in wholesale seizure of slaves and other property. In response, as states and local military forces became increasingly incapable of preventing plunder, slave flight, and marronage, slaveholders especially in the Lower South drove slaves to other areas, often hundreds of miles away. Along the way, slaves suffered from hunger and exposure and faced danger from men of both sides who plundered human property from the coffles. John Habersham, a prominent Georgia patriot leader, reported to Moravians in North Carolina that he had lost oxen and "some negroes" to a band of "*Liberty men*" in the backcountry town of Salisbury and several more to illness and starvation as they made their way to the relative stability of the Virginia Piedmont.[29]

The same ties of community and kinship that kept some groups of enslaved men and women on plantations also structured slaves' resistance to forced removal. Slaveholders often went to great lengths to prevent slaves from learning that separation from their families and communities was imminent. South Carolina planter William Snow, for example, gave his overseer special instructions on securing slaves for removal in anticipation of the British arrival: "Get cousin Billy to bring Mathias over to your house on business, then secure him well in Tom's care; then fetch Ben from cousin Stephen's and Ruth at Daniel's; these negroes, if they are not well secured, will get away. . . . [H]ave no mercy on these negroes or they will deceive you." According to Snow, the slaves must

not learn of the plan "until you are ready to set off, or the negroes will hide out of the way." In particular, Snow warned, "If you say the least about Ruth, she will run off, for she is an arch bitch."[30] Even on the march, slaves continued to respond by running away or with violence. The men in charge of Virginia's western lead mines, where numerous slaves were sent after having been seized, captured, or purchased by the state, complained on numerous occasions of slaves "going off with the British" or escaping beyond white settlements to the west.[31] The movement of escaped slaves to strange lands might provide opportunity to slip into the space created by the constantly shifting population and claim a temporary form of half freedom while fighting raged. Chapman Badgett, for one, passed as free for six years after allegedly murdering his owner en route from Goochland County, Virginia, to Kentucky in 1775.[32]

The movement across the line between slavery and freedom that allowed Badgett and others to exist in a liminal half freedom also defined the experience of the tens of thousands of slaves who escaped from plantations and reached the British army during the war. Even before the arrival of peace in 1783, British officers had attempted to regulate slave movement and respect the property rights of the loyalist citizens streaming into areas held by the British army. The Board of Police, created to maintain order in British-occupied Charleston during the war, responded to Gen. Alexander Leslie's request to deal with "that very great Inconvenience . . . found from Negroes leaving the services of their Masters and coming to the British Army." Fearing that "many bad Consequences would most certainly arise unless they could be sent back to their Labour," slaves in Charleston not claimed by a loyalist owner or British officer were forced to work on sequestered plantations without wages even though commanders remained unsure of the laborers' ultimate status.[33]

Once the British evacuation of the South became imminent, slaves crowded into cities and attached themselves to officers or soldiers, with decidedly mixed results. Despite the historical literature's emphasis on slaves who found freedom by escaping with the British, slaves within British lines were far more likely to be returned to slavery, either in America or abroad. The thousands of slaves who trailed Cornwallis on his slow march to Yorktown huddled in smallpox-infested camps outside the port and were seized by American soldiers and slaveholders after the general's surrender.[34] A few slaves attached themselves to sympathetic French soldiers who, much to Americans' consternation, took the bondsmen to Philadelphia, where rumors of impending emancipation already abounded.[35] General Washington, slaveholders, and state governors complained at length to French commanders "of Negroes being concealed at Williamsburg amongst the Troops" with expectations of receiving freedom.

Some eventually found freedom or new masters in Pennsylvania, yet far more were eventually returned to slavery through either seizure by American forces or sale to French colonies in the Caribbean.[36] Those slaves unable to leave with the French were detained around Williamsburg and Yorktown under a commission headed by David Ross. When proof of ownership was provided, slaves were returned to their owners—and their wrath.[37] Ross and other commissioners then sold slaves for whom proof of ownership was not forthcoming at a series of auctions in York and Gloucester, Virginia, for current money, certificates, or other forms of depreciated wartime currency.[38]

Even so, after the evacuation of Savannah and Charleston in 1782, thousands of slaves made their way with the British army from the South to New York in hopes of cementing their claim to freedom. Yet there, too, slaves found that despite officers' and British commanders' promises, liberty was largely contingent on good fortune. Southern slaveholders, including George Washington and Thomas Jefferson, hired "agents" to kidnap and forcibly return property rumored to be living within the city. In March 1783, one Hessian officer reported that "almost five thousand persons have come into this city to take possession again of their former property."[39] These agents dragged black men and women out of their beds at night and shackled them for the return south, an experience that Boston King, an escaped slave from South Carolina, recalled "filled us with dread and deprived us of sleep."[40] Other southern slaveholders sought to enlist the aid of delegates to the Continental Congress in returning slaves from Philadelphia before the departure of French troops suspected of keeping slaves or before a black southerner might find protection with a northern patron.[41] Although Washington's and Jefferson's slaves avoided capture, numerous other men and women were not so lucky. A young girl named Dinah explained to a Virginia constable that after the death of her master in South Carolina, she fled to the British in Charleston, who then took her to New York, where she took up work as a cook with an officer. The officer then brought her back to Virginia before returning with her to New York, where agents captured her. They subsequently returned her to Virginia for sale, but she again found her way to New York and finally departed with the British.[42]

The thousands of slaves who embarked with the British army at New York, Savannah, and Charleston often experienced similarly fluid movement back and forth between freedom and slavery. According to Sylvia Frey, at least 85 percent of the black men and women who embarked did so as the property of officers or loyalists.[43] Despite the fact that British officers on the ground secured the labor of escaped slaves with the promise of freedom, the British government

and individual soldiers and officers remained committed to the preservation of slavery and to protecting the material interests of the country's subjects. Indeed, during the evacuations of both Savannah and Charleston, British commanders went to extreme lengths to secure transport for human property whether or not a slaveholder or soldier could prove title. Still other slaves left with officers who had taken them as plunder in the field or employed them with the promise of freedom after the war.[44] British officers and sailors also kidnapped enslaved people, one of whom had been lured on board a ship docked in Philadelphia "with promises of freedom in Antigua."[45]

Regardless of how they came into the possession of fleeing loyalists or officers, however, escaped enslaved individuals left under the auspices of the British government, which took them throughout the Atlantic world. The overwhelming majority, however, went to British colonies in the Caribbean basin, where planters hoped to find land and privateers and officers expected to easily sell the slaves in their possession. Some twelve thousand enslaved individuals from the thirteen colonies went to East Florida, where a number of loyalists had relocated with their movable property to uncleared land granted them by the British government. There, slaves were almost immediately put to the backbreaking work of clearing swampland for cultivation near present-day Jacksonville. According to the governor of East Florida, Patrick Tonyn, many worked for up to two years "without provisions, money, cloathing or implements of agriculture, and in the most deplorable circumstances" in the unhealthy environs between the St. Johns and St. Marys Rivers.[46]

For those southern slaves taken into the Caribbean, the commitment to maintaining slavery in Jamaica, the Bahamas, and elsewhere as well as the ever-present desire for bonded labor forced many more "freed" men and women back into slavery. Frey has calculated that some sixty-five thousand slaves were brought into the port of Kingston between 1775 and 1785 alone, and many thousands more went to the relatively unpopulated Bahamas, where loyalists hoped to purchase cheap land.[47] As in Florida, loyalists who procured land in the Bahamas set the black southerners they claimed to clearing swamp and forest for cultivation of tropical crops, including cotton.[48] Many more black southerners, however, were sold to established Caribbean planters and found themselves in sugar fields, where their labor reduced many to a state of near death. Simon Taylor, one of the wealthiest Jamaican planters, told his agents in 1785 to stop purchasing slaves arriving from the mainland because they "are a set of soft Angola and Mundigo Negroes who are too lazy ever to provide provisions for themselves . . . & if not given themselves up [to die] they take to dirt-eating which is inevitable death."[49] In one remarkable

instance, British engineer James Moncrieff appears to have taken as many as eight hundred slaves with him on a transport from Charleston to the Mosquito Coast in present-day Guatemala. Moncrieff hoped to make a fortune harvesting mahogany there, but exposure, starvation, and Indian attacks killed all but a handful within a year.[50]

As in the mainland colonies, the disruptions of war precluded any easy resolution to the confusion created by competing ownership claims by officers, slaveholders, and slaves themselves. However, unless they could find support from an officer or local official, slaves' claims to freedom were invariably trumped by other claims that they were property, including claims by complicit officials happy to diminish the number of free black persons. An aide informed Tonyn "that five out of six of the Slaves in [East Florida] are held without any title deeds, and Bills of Sale were never given with the Negroes."[51] As a result, there and elsewhere officials required only the testimony of one or more white persons to establish claim to a black person's life and body. In other words, unless they had support, slaves who understood themselves as free could be and frequently were officially reenslaved simply on hearsay. If proper testimony could not be had, white men could and did forge bills of sale or titles to the slaves they claimed.[52] In several documented cases, British officers claimed as property slaves who had served the officers during the war and who had presumably assumed that they would receive freedom when the conflict ended.[53] Such was the complaint made by John Cruden, the official in charge of sequestered estates who became something of a crusader for both the freedmen and his personal pocketbook after the war. Writing from the island of Tortuga, which had become a clearinghouse for slaves after the war, Cruden reported that "many Negroes the property of the inhabitants of the Southern Provinces, have been offered for sale, and by people who have no right to dispose them." Most often, Cruden reported, these persons were indeed officers who had served in South Carolina and enticed the black persons "onto boats at the evacuation of Charles Town" by dangling a chance at freedom.[54]

Finally, in the clearest illustration of the movement across space and between slavery and freedom, during and immediately after the revolution a large number of the black men and women who left the South as freedpeople or as slaves found themselves returned to the United States just a few months or years later. Sometimes they were kidnapped or plundered by the same parties of "banditti" that had stolen humans during the war. Particularly notorious in the Carolina and Georgia backcountry were William Cunningham and Daniel McGirt, who led bands of black and white men who rounded up slaves and others in Florida and sold them back into Georgia and South Carolina.[55] Loyalists accused an-

other group, led by a close associate of the incoming Spanish governor, Vincent Manuel de Zespedes, of similar actions.[56]

More frequently, slaves were forcibly returned to the United States through sale. By the mid-1780s, the glut of loyalists arriving with many slaves and little land drove down the price of slaves in the Caribbean to a fifth of prewar levels. Rather than try to hire out their slaves or purchase land, numerous loyalists instead decided to sell their slaves back to the mainland, where demand was rapidly increasing, and use the proceeds to relocate to England. In one case, loyalist Elias Ball, one of South Carolina's wealthiest planters before the war, tried to set up a plantation and turn a profit by moving his 175 slaves to East Florida. After that experiment failed, taking the lives of more than thirty slaves, he sold the rest of his chattel back to his cousin (also named Elias) in South Carolina.[57] In another instance, agents seized slaves from Jamaica and sold them back to the Carolinas to settle debts owed by an exiled backcountry merchant, Eli Kershaw.[58] In certain cases, merchants from the mainland actively sought to use their connections to loyalists to buy back departed black men and women because, as Savannah merchant Joseph Clay explained, these slaves had already been "seasoned."[59] Another four thousand men and women left Florida with slaveholders who opted to move back to America rather than leave with the British after control of the colony transferred to the Spanish.[60] And in at least one case, a slave deceived by and then sold by an American sailor in Dominica requested to be returned to his master in the United States rather than remaining in the Caribbean.[61]

In a few cases, black loyalists were reenslaved after several years of freedom. Mary Postell ran away from her owner in South Carolina and received a certificate of freedom from British officers during the war. At the war's conclusion, her certificate was taken, and she was ordered into the service of a loyalist, Jesse Grey, who put Postell and her children to work harvesting a small plot in East Florida. After Postell fled and again claimed freedom, she found passage to Nova Scotia, where she lived for several years before being seized and claimed by Grey and his brother, John. The Grey brothers sold Postell for one hundred potatoes to a man named Singleton, who took her from her young daughters, Flora and Nelly, and sold her in North Carolina for a mere five pounds: her struggle for freedom and years of labor had apparently left her broken.[62] About the same time, Isaac Wheeler arrived in Charleston with other black men and women from Nova Scotia, where they had probably been kidnapped after living for years as freedpeople. Officials posted notice, and planters from neighboring states claimed many of the slaves. The state then gave Wheeler the unclaimed slaves to compensate him for his "service" in returning these men and women to slavery.[63]

As the confusion of war settled and black people's capacity for disruptive movement lessened, white southerners worked to resolidify the peculiar institution by reaffirming the intractability of a slave's legal status. The experience of a revolutionary war fought in the name of liberty necessarily provoked a strong and increasingly uniform reaction among white people as well as slaves. If the revolution was, as historian John Shy wrote, "a political education by military means," then slaves learned the deepest lesson.[64] At Great Bridge, Virginia, black men armed by Governor Dunmore wore sashes emblazoned with the words "LIBERTY to SLAVES."[65] At Charleston, black southerners took up arms and fought in the Black Dragoons and other black units. In some places, black men apparently even served as officers in loyalist militias.[66] Everywhere, black men and women served among British or patriot armies, and everywhere slaves and freedpeople watched and listened and remembered.

Precisely because the movement of slaves across space and between slavery and freedom had been so disruptive and so central to the conflict in the South, state governments' and slaveholders' primary legal response to the wartime actions of black southerners was the passage of new regulations that imposed stringent new restrictions on black southerners' mobility. In particular, these regulations sought to fix black southerners on one side of the freedom/unfreedom divide. In 1784, for example, white Charlestonians petitioned the state legislature to deal with the "numerous slaves, some falsely claiming to be FREE, who loiter in the city and refuse to return to service."[67] In rural areas, slaveholders complained that the taste of freedom during the war had eroded slaves' willingness to work. One Georgia planter observed that "freedom has ruined these wretches," and North Carolina planter and Anglican minister Charles Pettigrew found that he was unable to sell his unruly slaves in the French colony of Saint-Domingue. Planters there, he explained, "were too suspitious of [slaves'] Morals, when brought from the Continent," and after hiring out several slaves for trial, Pettigrew found himself forced to try to sell them in the United States.[68]

Postwar legislatures also responded to the what the South witnessed during the war and very specifically sought to bolster the divide between slavery and freedom. On the one hand, within three years of the war's end, each state responded to confusion over the status of "slaves passing as freemen" with legislation that more clearly defined both racial categories and the permanence of slaves' status as chattel. In June 1784, the North Carolina Assembly legally cemented the "one-drop" rule in the state, determining that "every person of descent from someone with Negro blood shall be considered a Negro . . . and from a Negro and an Indian a Mestizo."[69] The South Carolina House of As-

sembly similarly formed a special committee in 1785 in response to a series of petitions over the increase in freedpeople, declaring a year later that it was legal for any white person to demand proof of freedom from any unfamiliar black person. If a black person did not or could not provide proof, "it shall be lawful for the Negro to be committed to jail and sold by the Sherriff, proper notice having been posted so that rightful owners may submit claim."[70] Predictably, the greatest flurry of legislation surrounding the status of black people came from Virginia, which experienced the largest increase in free black individuals as a result of the war and the Chesapeake's transition from tobacco farming. The state declared in 1785 that "every person of whose grandfathers or grandmothers anyone is or shall have been A Negro, shall be deemed a Negro . . . and every person with one-fourth part or more of white blood, shall be a mulatto." The same year, the state defined enslaved people as those "who were so on the first day of this Assembly, and the descendants of the females from them."[71]

At the same time, states strengthened existing laws and wartime declarations intended to stop the free movement of both free and enslaved black people. The first postwar session of the Virginia Assembly passed a law declaring that "it shall be lawful for any justice of the peace to commit" black men and women "wandering through the country . . . to the gaol of his comity . . . and to confine him, her, or them in close gaol for three months," after which they were to be sold at auction if unclaimed.[72] In 1793, with the state's free black population increasing and complaints about slaves passing as free growing louder, the governor strengthened such provisions by signing legislation that explicitly declared that all black people without freedom papers should be presumed slaves. Any black man or woman who could not produce such papers was to be detained for six months; if unclaimed at the end of that period, he or she was to be sold into slavery. The same year, in another attempt to fix black people's status, Virginia required all free black men to register their name, age, color, wife, children, and profession with the clerk of a local court, imposing penalties of imprisonment and possible enslavement for noncompliance. And even if, as Kirt von Daacke has recently argued, black Virginians used connections among the white community to circumvent such registration laws when possible, this sort of legislation still barred unregistered slaves from accessing courts and other forms of legal recourse on their own.[73]

As a means of eliminating the spaces between slavery and freedom opened by the revolution, all of the southern states passed laws strengthening white southerners' authority to proclaim black people as enslaved or free. Georgia, for example, permitted any white man to "detain a Negro found traveling at night."[74] Although sympathetic white southerners might be willing to testify to

the good character and free status of black men and women, the desire to close the barrier between slavery and freedom led to the reenslavement of numerous black people claiming to be free. Advertisements posted by constables or jail keepers immediately after the war reveal countless instances in which black men or women who claimed to be free were confined and most likely sold.[75] A black man in Gloucester County, Virginia, was confined as a slave in spite of the fact that he produced a signed certificate attesting to his three-year service in the Continental Army: states' commitment to slavery trumped even revolutionary service.[76]

White southerners' efforts to contain the region's new population of free black people were most marked in North Carolina, the only state that passed wartime legislation—tellingly called An Act to Prevent Domestic Insurrections—expressly forbidding private manumission. The 1777 act permitted any white person to detain any black person claiming to be free and permitted the eventual sale of such persons.[77] Yet there as elsewhere, individuals—particularly Quakers—nevertheless attempted to free their slaves, often allowing them to work for their own wages or to live as free on land allotted them by their owners despite the legal prohibitions on such activities. But as the postwar generation solidified against the growing presence of freed slaves, their position became increasingly untenable. White North Carolinians inundated the legislature with petitions against the "scurrilous practice of allowing slaves to live as free," and in several instances slaves who had thought themselves free were reenslaved.[78] In 1791, 134 men, women, and children who had been set free by North Carolina Quakers during the war were arrested, separated, and sold.[79] In another case, North Carolina authorities seized a woman, Amy, after the death of her owner, Alexander Stafford, even though Amy had been living as free in Wilmington for more than a decade. Because Stafford died intestate and considerably in debt, Amy and her three daughters were auctioned off separately to cover claims on Stafford's estate.[80]

The actions of the city council in Charleston, which had the largest free black population of any southern city, foreshadowed the steps taken by the region's other municipal authorities. After patriot forces retook the city in 1782, the council responded to white residents' fears and complaints about competition from black workers by passing numerous restrictions and levying onerous fines on black tradesmen. A 1783 ordinance required all enslaved and free black tradespeople to purchase badges, a visible marker that indicated a person's location relative to the divide between freedom and unfreedom. Wilmington, North Carolina, passed a similar ordinance, requiring free black residents to register with their counties and wear a "badge of cloth . . . to be fixed on the

left shoulder, and to have thereon wrought in legible capital letters the word FREE."[81] The badges remained a mark of Charleston society through the Civil War and have now become expensive artifacts. Their cost varied depending on trade, with some, such as forty shillings hard money for butchers, seemingly prohibitively expensive.[82] The city also passed ordinances at the end of the war imposing a curfew on all black residents, slave or free. Slaves who ran afoul of the badge requirement or the curfew faced heavy fines and reenslavement if they could not pay.[83]

Beginning in the early 1790s, a wave of insurrection scares, both real and imagined, swept across the southern states, culminating in Gabriel's Rebellion in Richmond, Virginia, in 1800. Historians have attributed this increasingly violent and outspoken resistance to the growth of urban populations of freed black people and particularly to information arriving from Saint-Domingue, where slaves and free black persons had begun a successful revolt in 1791.[84] And, indeed, the Haitian Revolution left an indelible imprint on the minds of both slaves and terrified slaveholders.[85] Yet the brief stories of enslaved southerners such as Chapman Badgett, Amy, and Mary provide a new context for understanding black southerners' decision to take up arms for their freedom. As authorities closed the fissures in society and tried to contain the most radical impulses of the revolution, black people sought to maintain the spaces between slavery and freedom that had opened during the fighting. Having been touched by the revolution and heard in taverns and on farms that all men are created equal, black men and women faced an increasingly stark choice. As one slave, Glasgow, who was hanged alongside Gabriel declared, "Yes, I have a rose for my freedom, and I have never got it but, damn it, I will either die or be free."[86]

NOTES

1. Peter H. Wood, "'Taking Care of Business' in South Carolina: Republicanism and the Slave Society," in *The Southern Experience in the American Revolution*, ed. Jeffrey J. Crow and Larry E. Tise (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1978), 277.

2. James Madison quoted in Sylvia Frey, *Water from the Rock: Black Resistance in a Revolutionary Age* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991), 53.

3. Dunmore's 1775 proclamation was inspired by the scores of slaves who had gathered in front of his mansion in Williamsburg during the months before the governor's flight in November 1775. See John Selby, *The Revolution in Virginia, 1775–1783*, 2nd ed. (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 2007), 38.

4. For various estimates on slave desertions and deaths, see David Ramsay, *The History of the American Revolution*, ed. Lester H. Cohen (Indianapolis: Liberty Fund, 1990), 1:174; Frey, *Water from the Rock*, 211; Cassandra Pybus, "Jefferson's Faulty Math:

The Question of Slave Defections in the American Revolution," *William and Mary Quarterly* 62, no. 2 (June 2005): 243–64.

5. Important exceptions exist, but examples of this trend include many of the best works on the period. See Frey, *Water from the Rock*; Cassandra Pybus, *Epic Journeys of Freedom: Runaway Slaves of the American Revolution and Their Global Quest for Liberty* (Boston: Beacon, 2006); James W. St. G. Walker, *The Black Loyalists: The Search for a Promised Land in Nova Scotia and Sierra Leone, 1783–1870* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1992); Douglas R. Egerton, *Death or Liberty: African Americans and Revolutionary America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2009); Arthur Zilversmit, *The First Emancipation: The Abolition of Slavery in the North* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1967).

6. The titles of the most important books on this subject highlight their emphasis. See Ira Berlin, "The Revolution in Black Life," in *The American Revolution: Explorations in the History of American Radicalism*, ed. Alfred P. Young (DeKalb: University of Northern Illinois Press, 1976), 349–81; Ira Berlin, *Slaves without Masters: The Free Negro in the Antebellum South* (New York: Pantheon, 1974); Frey, *Water from the Rock*; Pybus, *Epic Journeys of Freedom*; Walker, *Black Loyalists*; Egerton, *Death or Liberty*.

7. See Zilversmit, *First Emancipation*.

8. Boston King, perhaps the most famous of the black loyalists, related his story in a 1798 autobiography, *Memoirs of the Life of Boston King, a Black Preacher, Written by Himself, during His Residence at Kingwood-School* (excerpted in *Unchained Voices: An Anthology of Black Authors in the English-Speaking World of the Eighteenth Century*, ed. Vincent Carretta [Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 2003], 351–68).

9. For the importance of movement as a point of both control and resistance, see Stephanie M. H. Camp, *Closer to Freedom: Enslaved Women and Everyday Resistance in the Plantation South* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2004).

10. Benjamin Quarles, *The Negro in the American Revolution* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press for the Institute of Early American History and Culture, 1961), vii.

11. The Continental Army alone consumed more than nine hundred thousand pounds of flour and eight hundred thousand pounds of fish and meat every month in 1778. See James A. Henretta, "The War for Independence and American Economic Development," in *The Economy of Early America: The Revolutionary Period, 1763–1790*, ed. Ronald Hoffman, John J. McCusker, Russell R. Menard, and Peter J. Albert (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia for the U.S. Capitol Historical Society, 1988), 45–87.

12. Quoted in Frey, *Water from the Rock*, 133.

13. For example, after the war, neighbors lynched a loyalist named Love who had slain wounded rebels after a skirmish. See Aedanus Burke to the Governor, December 14, 1784, in Aedanus Burke Papers, South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina, Columbia.

14. With notable exceptions, historians tend to downplay or entirely ignore the chaotic events in the southern theater. For a fuller treatment of this argument, see Matthew

Spooner, "Origins of the Old South: The Reconstitution of Southern Slavery, 1776–1800" (PhD diss., Columbia University, 2015); Matthew Spooner, "The Problem of Order and the Transfer of Slave Property in the Revolutionary South," in *The American Revolution Reborn: New Perspectives for the Twenty-First Century*, ed. Michael Zuckerman and Patrick Spero (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2016), 231–50.

15. A 1781 petition from Virginia's Henrico County complained to the state legislature that residents had "reason to believe that a great number of slaves which were taken by the British Army are now passing in this Country as free men" (quoted in Berlin, *Slaves without Masters*, 18).

16. Rachel N. Klein, *Unification of a Slave State: The Rise of the Planter Class in the South Carolina Backcountry, 1760–1808* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press for the Omohundro Institute of Early American History and Culture, 1990), chap. 2; Gregory O'Malley, *Final Passages: The Intercolonial Slave Trade of British America, 1619–1807* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2014), 267–83.

17. Compiled from Papers of the Loyalist Claims Commission, National Archives, Kew, England, AO12.

18. Richard Bennehan to James Martin, February 15, 1776, Cameron Family Papers, Southern Historical Collection, Wilson Library, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill; also quoted in Peter H. Wood, "Liberty Is Sweet: African-American Freedom Struggles in the Years before White Independence," in *Beyond the American Revolution: Explorations in the History of American Radicalism*, ed. Alfred F. Young (DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 1993), 179.

19. "Notice of Edward Telfair, Esq," 1776, in *The Revolutionary Records of the State of Georgia*, ed. Allen D. Candler (Atlanta: Franklin-Turner, 1908–10), 1:184.

20. See Joyce E. Chaplin, *An Anxious Pursuit: Agricultural Innovation and Modernity in the Lower South, 1730–1815* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1993), 216 n. 43.

21. Patrick Henry, Circular Letter, 1775, in William Augustine Washington Papers, David M. Rubenstein Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Duke University, Durham, N.C. Levying heavy fines on patrollers is an excellent example of states increasing enforcement of existing laws as well as passing new restrictions in response to perceived wartime threats. See also William P. Palmer, ed., *Calendar of Virginia State Papers and Other Manuscripts* (Richmond: Goode, 1883), 3:481.

22. Georgia offered bounties of four pounds for the head of a slave who was "making resistance." See "Journal of the Commons House of Assembly," in *Revolutionary Records*, ed. Candler, 14:292–93.

23. Samuel Stiles of Georgia, for example, wrote in 1779 that he had left "Primis and Parker and old woman named Doll to look after my stock and everything" on his Ogeechee plantation. See Samuel Stiles to William Telfair, February 21, 1779, Edward Telfair Papers, Rubenstein Library.

24. Joseph Clay to Mr. Cotter[?], Joseph Clay Letterbooks, II, microfilm, Georgia Historical Society, Savannah.

25. Robert Carter to William Prescott, April 16, 1782, Robert Carter Letterbooks, Rubenstein Library.

26. Josiah Smith complained of violence and "Depredations" committed by "the Marronage Negros" around Charleston who in one February 1780 raid beat a local minister to death. See Josiah Smith to Dr. J. J. Tubby, August 22, 1780, Josiah Smith Letterbooks, Southern Historical Collection. The most extensive study of maroon activity during the revolution can be found in Hugo Prosper Leaming, "Hidden Americans: Maroons of Virginia and the Carolinas" (PhD diss., University of Illinois at Chicago, 1979).

27. Josiah Smith to George Appleby, December 2, 1780, in Josiah Smith Letterbooks.

28. Bennehan's plantation ledger shows shoe purchases from 1773 to 1778 and 1783 to 1786, but none for the intervening years, when fighting was fiercest. See "Slave Ledger," Cameron Family Papers.

29. Adelaide L. Fries, ed., *Records of the Moravians of North Carolina* (Raleigh: Edwards & Broughton, 1930), 4:1542.

30. William Snow to Mr. Rhoades, September 1, 1781, Francis Marion Papers, Special Collections, New York Public Library, New York.

31. Palmer, *Calendar of Virginia State Papers*, 8:77, 79, 98, 113, 156, 183.

32. *Virginia Gazette*, February 3, 1781.

33. "At a Council held at the Commandants, Tuesday, June 13 1780," in "Records of the Board of Police," microfilm, South Carolina Historical Society, Charleston. For information on sequestered estates, see Jeffrey J. Crow, "What Price Loyalism? The Case of John Cruden, Commissioner of Sequestered Estates," *North Carolina Historical Review* 58, no. 3 (July 1981): 215–33.

34. For the ghastly effects of smallpox on slaves with the British, see Elizabeth Fenn, *Pox Americana: The Great Smallpox Epidemic of 1775–82* (New York: Hill and Wang, 2002).

35. Governor Harrison to General Washington, July 11, 1782, in *Official Letters of the Governors of Virginia*, vol. 3, *The Letters of Thomas Nelson and Benjamin Harrison*, ed. H. R. McIlwaine (Richmond: Virginia State Library, 1929), 265–66.

36. Governor Harrison to Count Rochambeau, June 26, 1782, and Governor Harrison to the Virginia Delegates in Congress, July 6, 1782, both in ibid., 257–58, 260.

37. Slaveholders in older planting areas quite often sold returned slaves westward or to the Caribbean rather than attempting to reincorporate those seen as rebellious. In 1783, for example, William Camp of Virginia sold "my wench Elsa" who had "been with the British" for "70 pounds in land" to a trader sailing to the Caribbean. See Bill of Sale, Corbin Family Papers, Albert and Shirley Small Special Collections Library, University of Virginia, Charlottesville.

38. "After Orders, Oct 25, 1781," Anthony Wayne Orderly Book with Washington's Army, Huntington Library, Pasadena, Calif. Ross put notices for the slaves in Virginia newspapers: see, for example, *Virginia Gazette*, January 5, 1782.

39. Quoted in Pybus, *Epic Journeys of Freedom*, 63.

40. Ibid., 65–67.

41. Governor Harrison to the Virginia Delegates in Congress, July 6, 1782, in *Official Letters*, ed. McIlwaine, 260.

42. *Virginia Gazette*, March 16, 1782.

43. Frey, *Water from the Rock*, chap. 6.

44. Overseeing the evacuation of Charleston, Alexander Leslie wrote that he apprehended "a number of Negroes the property of citizens of Persons in this Province, which were allowed as servants to the officers, . . . are now embarked on board the different transports" leaving the city (Alexander Leslie to General O'Hara, May 3, 1782, General Alexander Leslie Letterbooks, New York Public Library).

45. William Brownson and George Wald to Unknown, August 13, 1782, Telfair Papers.

46. Patrick Tonyn quoted in Maya Jasanoff, *Liberty's Exiles: American Loyalists in the Revolutionary World* (New York: Knopf, 2011), 97.

47. Frey, *Water from the Rock*, 182–83.

48. Whitemarsh B. Seabrook, *A Memoir on the Origin, Cultivation, and Uses of Cotton, from the Earliest Ages to the Present Time* (Charleston: Miller & Browne, 1844), 198–99.

49. Quoted in Jasanoff, *Liberty's Exiles*, 258–59. Dirt eating, frequently reported among newly landed slaves, seems to have resulted from severe nutritional deficiencies.

50. Greg Elliot to James Moncrieff, September 23, 1783, "Memorial of Moncrief to the Right Honourable Lords Commissioners of His Majesty's Treasury," [1780s], James Moncrieff Papers, William Clements Library, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.

51. James Hume to Patrick Tonyn, July 26, 1784, in Joseph Byrne Lockey, ed., *East Florida, 1783–1785: A File of Documents Assembled, and Many of Them Translated* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1949), 328–31.

52. Francis Philip Fatio to Vincent Manuel de Zespedes, August 30, 1784, in ibid., 121–23.

53. Claim of William Hunter, Papers of the Loyalist Claims Commission, National Archives, Kew, England, P/O 882; Carole Watterson Troxler, "Re-Enslavement of Black Loyalists: Mary Postell in South Carolina, East Florida, and Nova Scotia," in *Acadiensis* 37, no. 2 (Summer 2008): 70–85.

54. John Cruden to C. Nisbet, March 25, 1783, Guy Carleton Papers, New York Public Library.

55. Both Cunningham and Girt eventually were exiled to New Providence along with slaves whom they had presumably taken during or immediately after the war. See Vincente Manuel de Zespedes to Bernando de Galvez, August 9, 1784, in *East Florida*, ed. Lockey, 243.

56. Memorial of John Fox, July 25, 1785, in ibid., 667–68.

57. William Henry Siebert, ed., *Loyalists in East Florida, 1774 to 1785: The Most Important Documents Pertaining Thereto Edited with an Accompanying Narrative* (Deland: Florida State Historical Society, 1929), 126–27.

58. William Cumine to John Chesnut, September 12, 1784, John Chesnut Papers, South Carolina Historical Society.

59. Joseph Clay to Edward Telfair, December 6, 1784, Joseph Clay Letterbooks.

60. Lockey, introduction to *East Florida*, 10.

61. On January 6, 1778, Charles Winstone wrote to James Irvin, "I take the Liberty of informing you, that on Sunday last the 4th inst I was lucky enough to secure for you a Negro Man named Sharpe, who tells me he is your property—he was on board of a French Packet Boat bound for Martinique to Guadaloupe, under the care of an American Sailor, who I suspect intended to dispose of him at the last mentioned island. The fellow informs me, he was taken in your Shallop returning to Granada, after he had been at St Vincent, by an American Privateer and carried into St Lucia, that he was afterwards carried to Martinique, and from thence was going to Guadaloupe. That he was under the care of the American Sailor, who pretended to have purchased him from one Munro the Captain of the Privateer. Sharpe Himself made the discovery in consequence of which it came to my knowledge, and as the King's Solicitor General of this Island I thought it my Duty to interfere" (Charles Winstone Letterbook, Clements Library).

62. Troxler, "Reenslavement of Black Loyalists." Troxler's short but excellent article covers new and important ground and deserves wider attention.

63. Letters Concerning the Negroes from Nova Scotia, 1785–86, General State Assembly Records, Legislative Papers, North Carolina State Archives, Raleigh. Wheeler's acquisition of the slaves is mentioned in Richard Caswell to "Dear Sir," July 10, 1786, Letters Concerning the Negroes from Nova Scotia, 1785–1786, General State Assembly Records, Legislative Papers, North Carolina State Archives.

64. John Shy, "The American Revolution: The Military Conflict Considered as a Revolutionary War," in *Essays on the American Revolution*, ed. Stephen G. Kurtz and James H. Hutson (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1973), 121–56.

65. Selby, *Revolution in Virginia*, 38.

66. After the war, the widow of a loyalist petitioned against the confiscation of her property by saying that her husband "accepted the Command of the Goosecreek Company [of loyalist militia] Chiefly to prevent its being given to a black man" (Petition of Mary Brown on Behalf of Archibald Brown, February 15, 1783, in *The State Records of South Carolina: Journals of the House of Representatives, 1783–1784*, ed. Theodora J. Thompson and Rosa S. Lumpkin [Columbia: University of South Carolina Press for the South Carolina Department of Archives and History, 1977], 144–45).

67. Memorial of the Inhabitants of Charleston, August 4, 1784, in Petitions to the General Assembly, Legislative Papers 1782–1866, South Carolina Department of Archives and History, Columbia.

68. Charles Pettigrew to Mary Pettigrew, March 11, 1785, Pettigrew Family Papers, Southern Historical Collection.

69. Walter Clark, ed., *Colonial and State Records of North Carolina* (Goldsboro, N.C.: Nash, 1899), 17:284.

70. Lark Emerson Adams, ed., *Journal of the House of Representatives, 1785–1786* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1979), 327.

71. Acts of the Virginia Assembly, chaps. 77–78, in Jane Purcell Guild, *The Black Laws of Virginia* (1936; Berwyn, Md.: Heritage, 2012), 62, 84.

72. An Act to Strengthen an Act for the Regulation of Slaves, 1783, in William Waller Hening, *The Statutes at Large: Being a Collection of All the Laws of Virginia, from the First Session of the Legislature, in the Year 1619* (Richmond, Va.: Cochran, 1823), 9:23–25.

73. Kirt von Daacke, *Freedom Has a Face: Race, Identity, and Community in Jefferson's Virginia* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2012), 19–23. See also Gerald Mullin's aged but still valuable *Flight or Rebellion: Slave Resistance in Eighteenth-Century Virginia* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1972), especially chaps 6–8.

74. Candler, *Revolutionary Records*, 3:421.

75. See, for example, *Charleston Evening Gazette*, October 14, 1783; *Georgia Gazette*, February 2, 1784; *Virginia Gazette*, December 12, 1783.

76. *Virginia Gazette*, January 13, 1784.

77. "An Act to Prevent Domestic Insurrection, and for Other Purposes," in *Colonial and State Records*, ed. Clark, 9:288–89.

78. Petition of the Citizens of Wilmington, April 23, 1786, in General State Assembly Records, Legislative Papers, North Carolina State Archives.

79. See "A List of Emancipated Blacks, Taken Up and Sold by Order of the County Courts of Pasquotank, Perquimons and Chowan, in Consequence of Several Acts of the General Assembly of the State of North Carolina, since the Passing of the First Act in the Year 1777, to the Present Time," in James Iredell, *Laws of the State of North-Carolina* (Edenton, N.C.: Hodge & Wills, 1791), 637–38.

80. "Petition of Joseph White, Administrator of All and Singular the Goods of Alexander Stafford, Late of the County of Perquimany," in General State Assembly Records, Legislative Papers, North Carolina State Archives.

81. Jeffrey J. Crow, "Slave Rebelliousness and Social Conflict in North Carolina, 1775 to 1802," *William and Mary Quarterly* 37, no. 1 (January 1980): 93.

82. City ordinances published in *Charleston Evening Gazette*, July 28, 1786. See also Harlan Greene, Harry S. Hutchins Jr., and Brian E. Hutchins, *Slave Badges and the Slave-Hire System in Charleston, South Carolina, 1783–1865* (Jefferson, N.C.: McFarland, 2008).

83. H. M. Henry, *Police Control of the Slave in South Carolina* (Emory, Va.: n.p., 1914), 47.

84. For the influence of urban connections and of the Haitian Revolution on Gabriel's Rebellion, see Douglas Egerton's excellent book, *Gabriel's Rebellion: The Virginia Slave Conspiracies of 1800 and 1802* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1993). See also James Sidbury, *Ploughshares into Swords: Race, Rebellion, and Identity in Gabriel's Virginia, 1730–1810* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997).

85. For broad analyses of America's reaction to the Haitian Revolution, see Ashli White, *Encountering Revolution: Haiti and the Making of the Early Republic* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2008); James Alexander Dun, "Dangerous Intelligence: Slavery, Saint Domingue, and the Haitian Revolution in the Early American Republic" (PhD diss., Princeton University, 2011).

86. Glasgow quoted in Peter J. Albert, "The Protean Institution: The Geography, Economy, and Ideology of Slavery in Postrevolutionary Virginia," (PhD diss., University of Maryland, 1976), 217.

To Fashion Ourselves Citizens

Colonization, Belonging, and the Problem of Nationhood in the Atlantic South, 1829–1859

ANDREW N. WEGMANN

Once brought to mind, no one seemed to let the idea of colonization fade away in the nineteenth century. The question of what to do with the free colored population of the United States, especially those born enslaved, caused endless debate, confusion, and fear in nearly every political arena from the nation's founding to the end of the Civil War and beyond.[1] Both before and during that time, legislation and ideology met in the creation of a theoretically aggregated community described variously as "free Negroes," "the Negroes," "freedmen," and "recently manumitted slaves."[2] This population, in the minds of legislators and politically active citizens, represented "great and alarming mischiefs" in society, a threat to the slave system, and an example of the possible disintegration of Western society through either slave rebellion or cultural and moral degeneration.[3] They corrupted slaves with the image of their freedom; they made up an anomalous class in a seemingly regimented society, neither entirely free nor enslaved; and as social outliers, they questioned the character and meaning of America's God-given Anglo-Saxon republican identity.

The so-called great men of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, from Thomas Jefferson to Abraham Lincoln, commented on this "troublesome group" and what would be required for the United States to advance socially and culturally without it. Most notably, Jefferson believed that Europeans and Africans could not and indeed should not live in the same society as a consequence of "deep rooted prejudices entertained by the whites" as well as "the real distinctions which nature has made." To avoid an eruption of violent "convulsions" between the two groups, the future president concluded in 1785 that freedmen "should be colonized to such place as the circumstances of the time should render most proper."[4] It was upon this logic, some thirty years after Jefferson first wrote on the subject, that the American Colonization Society (ACS) formed in Washington, D.C., in late December 1816.

Led by some of the most senior statesmen of the era, the ACS passed itself off as a benevolent society resolute in the maintenance of American cultural and social identities as well as the protection and relocation of the "masses of free people of colour of the United States" to a place "more suitable to their capabilities, needs and wants."[5] As an organization, it never chose one side of the "free Negro" question, claiming only to work on behalf of "all those thus engaged in our enterprise," whether they be "anomalous" and "abandoned" free people of color in Virginia and Louisiana or slaveholding planters in South Carolina, Georgia, and Mississippi.[6] The society struck the perfect chord of neutrality amid an increasingly divided American public, holding the attention of the American people for more than five decades.[7]

Scholars have recently positioned the ACS as the historical standard-bearer of colonizationist ideology in the nineteenth century as well as the most public example of whites imposing their collective will on a helpless, oppressed "black community" in the United States beyond slavery itself. Indeed, nearly every recent study engages the ACS, and the more general idea of "black removal" in the nineteenth century in this vein, often losing sight of on-the-ground realities such as volition, individual will, and social planning within the communities targeted by the society.[8] As a result, few have looked past the white leaders and organizers of the movement who believed that "the African is a degraded member of the human family" who must "live and thrive elsewhere" or past the northern African American abolitionists of the antebellum decades who publicly denounced the movement as a "scheme [by whites] to drive us from our country and homes."[9]

The idea of removal, of leaving the United States for another land believed better than the last, meant more than just falling under the spell of the ACS Board of Managers and traveling blindly to the distant "land of your ancestors."[10] To many free people of color, especially those in the South who possessed education, mixed racial ancestries, some wealth, and middle-class sentiments, the idea of changing location came with a sense of empowerment and hope, of mobility and protection. In cities as geographically and culturally distant as Richmond and Petersburg, Virginia, and New Orleans, middle-class colored families saw colonization and emigration not as a white scheme for displacement and exile but rather as a chance to make more of themselves, their cultures, and their communities, to maintain the insularity, both social and racial, they had protected and built over the preceding century or more. From this perspective, they created a sense of nationhood that transcended or even escaped the restrictive bounds of American citizenship and legal acceptance. In some cases, this localized nationhood mirrored that of the United States and its

historical foundations. In others, it remained rooted in place, connected more to the local culture than the political nation that governed its practitioners. The notion of belonging, however, remained constant. To free middle-class people of color in the Atlantic South, citizenship and legitimacy required a "nation" that seemed to lie outside the ideological borders of the United States, and colonization, regardless of location and form, served as a vehicle for realizing where that "nation" stood.

In the face of legislative and social movements across the South to universalize the "free Negro" and erase any distinction, legal or otherwise, between mulattoes, Negroes, and slaves, men like François Lacroix, Armand Lanusse, Joseph Jenkins Roberts, and Louis Nelson Fouché, among countless others, openly discussed the idea of moving away from their lives in the United States. But their reasons did not always align with the conclusions of most recent scholarship—that which paints the ACS and colonization more generally as a coercive, violent, and unequivocally oppressive enterprise.[11] These mixed-race middle-class men and their families used the idea of removal as a way of fulfilling personal and communal legitimacy, expanding business opportunities, and taking a step up into an aristocratic, politically active class.

They were not part of the huddled masses of freedmen leaving for an unknown African frontier at the behest of their former masters and white "philanthropists" in Philadelphia and Washington, D.C. Rather, they were self-promoting entrepreneurs, savvy businessmen, and ambitious, talented craftsmen seeking expanded wealth, cultural protection, and a definitive sense of belonging in the political and financial realms. They did not simply want freedom. They already had that. They wanted legitimacy—a recognized position in a society that honored ancestry, business acumen, and traditional cultural institutions. If they could not be citizens in the United States, they would make themselves citizens elsewhere. The urge existed in every corner of the South, and some of these men made more of it than others.

On January 3, 1848, a sunny Monday on the west coast of Africa, Joseph Jenkins Roberts, a freeborn native of Norfolk, Virginia, addressed a gathering crowd. This was no standard occasion. Indeed, nothing like it had ever happened before. Having declared independence from the American Colonization Society just six months earlier, the Republic of Liberia had just inaugurated its first president. And that president, the Virginia-born Roberts, was about to greet the world for the first time. "I feel, fellow citizens, that the present is a momentous period in the history of Liberia," he declared. Through the grace of an "all wise Providence," Liberians everywhere had taken upon their shoulders the

legacy of "a mere handful of isolated pilgrims, in pursuit of civil and religious liberty." And just as "Almighty God delivered them" to the "promised land," so too would he "crown our efforts with success."[12]

His words touched on a shared history hardly forgotten with independence. Like the pilgrims of Plymouth Rock, "free people of color of the United States," Roberts explained, had grown "tired of the oppressions which weighed them down" in their native land. There, he continued, the white population had "withheld . . . those civilities and that comity which marks the friendly intercourse between civilized and independent communities—in consequence of our weakness and present poverty." But with the help of the "Divine Disposer" and the "wealth, vigor, virtue, and consequent happiness" of "our national past," these pilgrims had, to Roberts, fashioned "a land of liberty" from "a wilderness of difficulties."[13]

Roberts fabricated the Liberian "national past" from the only historical memory he and his fellow Liberians knew—that of the United States. Having come from Virginia, Roberts and nearly forty-five hundred other emigrants served as emissaries of the nation that had rejected them as well as thousands of others still bound by "the chains of prejudice." This rhetoric—tales of a second, colored American founding, a new "land of liberty" proving the capacities of a people both rebuffed by and raised according to American notions of republicanism, virtue, and deliverance—was nothing new.[14] Indeed, since the inception of the American Colonization Society, and even before, many white politicians and philanthropists argued that people of color, if raised to understand and appreciate the seemingly exceptional character of American freedom and virtue, could re-create a system based upon those same concepts outside of white society.[15] In contrast to a number of Enlightenment thinkers as well as Thomas Jefferson, the ACS founders and other colonization proponents stopped short of declaring Africans and their descendants in America inherently inferior to the European in aspects of body and mind.[16] Instead, the society's leaders claimed that the difference was cultural. Africans had not lived and grown under the influence of Enlightened ideologies and practices. They had not yet come to understand the benefits of Christianity and Western morals, even after decades in the United States.[17]

Roberts and his new fellow citizens saw themselves as a vanguard of sorts—"isolated pilgrims" successful in claiming the "inalienable rights" granted them by a shared but distant origin and history. But this vision of escape and reformation, exile and reclamation, did not limit itself to the hearts and minds of colonizationists and free people of color in the Upper South and Northeast.[18] In New Orleans, more than a thousand miles south, a number of free people of

color as well as some white planters and philanthropists advocated colonization and voluntary exile from white America. And in theory, their ideas mirrored those of Roberts and the first "pilgrims" of Liberia.

In the pages of *L'Union*, the city's increasingly radical French-language newspaper, Arnaud Lanusse penned a series of letters. A freeborn native of the town, Lanusse had gained local fame for publishing the first collection of African American poetry in the United States (*Les Cenelles* [The Hawthorns]) a decade earlier in 1845. Of mixed race and proud of it, Lanusse ran at the highest levels of New Orleans colored society. He was a Confederate sympathizer at the start of the Civil War, served as principal of the city's only colored school, and owned more than ten slaves over the course of his life.[19] He was not the model of "free black" masses huddled between immovable walls of prejudice and race-based legislation that appears in many studies. He was, quite simply, an "elite of his people"—educated, wealthy, and as respected as nearly any middle-class man of his time and place.[20] But he, like Roberts and hundreds of others, felt the need to leave.

His letters, crafted as responses to French-born mulatto Édouard Tinchant, an outspoken supporter of the new Republican Party, echo the complaints that inspired hundreds of freeborn Virginians to leave the nation of their birth for the unknown liberty awaiting them on Africa's Grain Coast. "The title of 'fellow citizen' with which the gentleman [Tinchant] honors me," Lanusse wrote, "unfortunately belongs neither to him nor to me." In Louisiana, "the land for which I have shouldered my rifle and marched," the "man of color cannot be a citizen." This had always been the case, Lanusse insisted. Even after "all of our boys and men had gathered under the call of [Andrew] Jackson" and "shared blood" against a common foe in 1815, "the inhabitants [of the United States] professed only the greatest indifference or the deepest contempt" for "the race of men born on this ground."[21] Lanusse could find only one solution. "When oppression makes a revolution necessary," he wrote, citing the Marquis de Lafayette rather than the better-known American Declaration of Independence, "insurrection is the most sacred of duties." But that insurrection, whether social or political, he believed, "cannot happen here."[22]

Much like the Liberian "pilgrims," Lanusse sought citizenship of some sort, freedom from a legally enforced second-class life. And he was not alone. Between the founding of the ACS and the outbreak of the Civil War, a number of New Orleans colored elite considered voluntary exile. François Lacroix, an extremely wealthy and cosmopolitan mixed-race tailor, flirted with the idea in the late 1830s. In a letter to his close friend and business partner, Etienne Cordeviolle, Lacroix admitted, "I have often thought to leave here." Although

he owned nearly $180,000 in landed property, held six slaves, and operated two tailoring shops for primarily white clients, Lacroix felt "stuck to my reputation" in New Orleans, "not able to stand between the two sections" of the city. "I think I may join you where we better fit," he mused to his friend.[23]

But Lacroix was not speaking of Liberia, then a growing colony at the height of its antebellum popularity. Indeed, when asked by the City Court of New Orleans in 1841 whether Cordeviolle had left for Liberia, Lacroix responded sharply: "M. Cordeviolle did not remove to the negro Country. He found his place in Paris, in France."[24] During that decade alone, nearly two dozen wealthy, francophone mixed-race New Orleanians left for Paris. In court cases and successions, endless references to friends and business partners "recently removed" to the French capital appear. Joseph Dumas, a close friend of Lacroix as well as one of the wealthiest colored men in the South, packed up his tailoring business in 1846 and moved his family to Paris, where he died in 1880.[25] Erasme Legoaster, Bernard Soulié, and Julien Colvis—all wealthy, educated, respected businessmen in the city—withdrew to France together in 1848 and set up a lending and brokerage firm, the same sort of enterprise they had operated in New Orleans for nearly twenty years.[26]

Beyond those two dozen wealthy colored Creoles, very few free people of color from New Orleans ever left the country in search of a better life, and fewer still looked to Liberia and the American Colonization Society to supply that life. In fact, between 1831, when the Louisiana affiliate of the ACS formed, and 1862, when the state fell to the Union army, just sixteen individual freeborn Louisianans left for Liberia. Of those sixteen, eight were from New Orleans.[27] Of the emigrants who left records, just one, Ely Gale, a fifty-eight-year-old "mulatto" brick maker, owned property. He was also one of two literate emigrants, and he employed six "young Negroes" at his shop on Common Street, in the "American Section" of New Orleans.[28] He spoke English as his mother tongue, as far as records will tell, and had no recorded financial or social interactions with Lacroix, Dumas, Lanusse, and other members of the city's Creole elite. He was a Methodist, and his parents had been slaves in Virginia.[29]

The Louisiana Colonization Society (LCS), which formed alongside that of Mississippi, attracted Gale and his wife, Sylvia, an illiterate "mulatto" seamstress, rather than Lacroix and Lanusse.[30] Run by Methodists and Presbyterians, the LCS failed miserably at engaging the more refined elements of New Orleans's colored community, most of whom were francophone Catholics.[31] But it was not for lack of trying. Between 1826 and 1859, the ACS and LCS placed no fewer than 417 advertisements in New Orleans newspapers alone.[32] Organizers had high hopes despite the "ostensibly minor variance in religious form."[33] In-

deed, in 1836 the ACS board of directors concluded that "throughout the Union there is no field of better promise to the cause; none from which emigrants in larger numbers, or more suitable, are to be expected" than the "Auxiliary Associations in Mississippi and Louisiana."[34]

These hopes were well founded. New Orleans contained more than 11,500 free people of color in 1830—the third-largest community in the nation.[35] Throughout the 1820s and early 1830s, the ACS had met surprising success in places with much smaller free colored communities. In 1829, it had filled the brig *Harriet* with 102 freeborn residents of Petersburg, Virginia, which had a free colored population of 2,030.[36] Those emigrants included Joseph Jenkins Roberts; his mother, Amelia; and his seven siblings; as well as nineteen members of the Spriggs Payne family. Members of the dynastic Cheeseman family also left on board the *Harriet*, along with Randolph Cooper, one of the most successful Liberian merchants of the nineteenth century; his wife, Nancy; and his three brothers.[37] Nearly all of the men and some of the women on the *Harriet* had at least some education, and of those for whom records exist, more than half owned property. The vast majority were also of mixed race.[38]

Joseph Roberts stood out only through his actions after he landed in Liberia. While in the United States, he fit the mold of any ambitious mixed-race man from a respectable family. Born in Norfolk but raised in Petersburg, he was educated at the Union Street Methodist Church and began his career as a clerk for a trading firm on Sycamore Street downtown.[39] In 1826, he started a trading firm of his own with his friend William Nelson Colson, a "mulatto" barber and part-time river trader.[40] From the beginning, Roberts, Colson, and Company prospered. In 1827, the firm brought in more than ninety-eight hundred dollars after expenses, trading with at least twenty-six different firms—all run by white men—along and across the Mason-Dixon Line.[41] Roberts and Colson employed seven "Negro youths" and three of Colson's slaves.[42] They sold perfume, tobacco, leather knickers, shoes, silk vests and coats, stockings, cravats, and kid gloves. They advertised, as Lacroix did in New Orleans, their fine imported silks and the "latest designs of Europe."[43] They built a small empire that crossed state lines and paid little mind to color or race. And they made a good sum of money doing it.

Beyond his speeches as president of Liberia, Roberts left no clear indication as to why he and his family left Petersburg. Although he spoke of the "chains of prejudice" and heavy-handed "oppressions," Roberts and his family, along with the families of James Spriggs Payne and Randolph Cooper, stood above many of the racially defining laws on which many scholars have focused that sought to establish a universal "free Negro" class in the antebellum South.

Years passed before most of these families appeared in the city's "Register of Free Negroes & Mulattoes," if they ever appeared at all. Joseph Roberts, Randolph Cooper, and David Payne (James's father) regularly traveled beyond Virginia's borders to New York, Baltimore, and Philadelphia and back to their home state in spite of legislation forbidding their return.[44] Mixed-race, financially stable, and educated, they maintained reputations at the ground level that placed them outside the aggregate "free Negro" population of the state. The laws, in the eyes of those who lived and did business with these men, targeted a different, more "dangerous," more abstract class of people to which Roberts and company did not belong.[45]

The one constant among these emigrants is economic opportunity. As the ACS preached a message of racial and national rebirth on the west coast of Africa, Roberts, Cooper, and Payne saw dollar signs. When Roberts left for Liberia, Colson stayed in Petersburg, and Roberts, Colson, and Company continued to thrive. Roberts continually wrote to ask his partner about the viability of new African products such as camwood and palm oil in the American market. Even while serving as colonial governor of Liberia, Roberts traveled to New York and Philadelphia not as a political representative of the colony but as a representative of his firm.[46] Francis and James Spriggs Payne collaborated with Beverly Yates, a native of Richmond, to form Payne and Yates, a trading company that operated out of Monrovia and traded with white merchants in Richmond and Norfolk.[47] It is interesting to note that all of the first four presidents and vice presidents of Liberia as well as most of their cabinet members took part in trading enterprises in Liberia built on connections and relationships established in the United States.[48] And perhaps more importantly, all of these men worked together to keep both business and politics contained within their social and political circles.[49]

These men and their families, in reality, were not the "isolated pilgrims" President Roberts celebrated in his inaugural speech. They, like Lanusse and Lacroix in New Orleans, were wealthy, middle-class colored men looking to remake themselves in the image of America's political elite. They were cosmopolitan, literate, cunning individuals seeking a step up in society. The ACS and Liberia could give them that. The image of the "isolated pilgrims" coded the leaders' economic and social intentions in language that smacked of universal suffering and racial pride. It painted the "black" Liberian Republic in the image of its white American father—a new nation capable of spreading virtue, Christianity, and enlightenment to a previously benighted land. The rhetoric of Liberian independence was really the language of American nationhood extended across the Atlantic. Roberts and his fellow Americo-Liberians saw

their lives in Africa as extensions of their lives in the United States. Only this time they could be the leaders; they could make the rules, define citizenship, and make sense of the virtue they always felt but never saw. They had created an independent Liberia, but in a very real way, they each fashioned their own personal American nation.

The tenets of this American national imagination never appealed to Lacroix or Lanusse, but neither of them ever followed their own advice and set out for a "better fit," even after a number of their friends had left, never to return. Lacroix simply and quietly stayed, expanding his empire into the 1850s, writing to his friends in Paris, and raising a close-knit, well-connected family in the city he loved.[50] He never made much of the Civil War when it finally came, and in spite of his social prominence and wealth, he never showed any interest in running for office or serving as a leader of the colored population after the war ended. It was said that he lived a happy life after dreaming of Paris, visiting his grandchildren daily and hosting dinner parties attended by "every respectable character in colored society." According to his son, François Edgar, he "passed in society & in the community for a colored man" and "visited and frequented the society of colored men," although "his complection [*sic*] was white." He was a loving father and grandfather and "made clothes his entire life."[51] He was happy where he was and felt no need to explore other venues. He chose to remain a man of color in his adopted home rather than cast his lot in a foreign land, even with the potential offered by his white complexion. In his last recorded letter to the Cordeviolle family, dated February 12, 1862, just two months before New Orleans fell to the Union, he expressed this feeling: "We are fine here. I am fine. . . . Business has slowed, but I will stay as long as it takes. . . . We are all fine. We are all happy."[52]

Lanusse, however, remained less quiet and continued to dream of other places. In 1857, when his close friend, Louis Nelson Fouché, led a group of locals to eastern Mexico in hopes of starting a "Colony for Foreign Nationals Known as Eureka," Lanusse applauded the effort, though he refused to join.[53] In *L'Union*, he praised the emigrants as "pioneers of their class" whose "patriotism cannot be questioned."[54] But their patriotism was not necessarily wrapped in the historical memory of America's founding, as it was in ACS rhetoric and the speeches of Liberia's national leaders. Indeed, Fouché and his *Étranger Nationaux* planned to leave the United States entirely, giving up their "association" with that country and entering into a volitional alliance with the Mexican Republic.[55] In this way, they were seeking a truer sense of citizenship—allegiance in return for governmental protection. But the effort did not constitute a national rebirth or an attempt at cultural expansion. It was, if anything, a step

back, a step away from an increasingly uncomfortable life in New Orleans—in Lanusse's words, "a call back to the original."[56]

But in the end, fewer than one hundred people left for Eureka, and within two years, those who did not die returned home.[57] Two years later, Emile Desdunes, a friend of Fouché and Lanusse, led a group with a similar purpose to Haiti. But that scheme, too, collapsed when life on the impoverished island proved more difficult than liberating.[58] In truth, these *gens de couleur* wanted to leave the United States, not to relive a past denied them by prejudice or claim a sense of citizenship lost in an increasingly oppressive legal environment. Catholic, mixed-race, and francophone, Lacroix, Fouché, Lanusse, and literally countless others did not fit into the nineteenth-century "American" mold. On the fields of Chalmette in 1815, awaiting the first lines of British regulars, the members of the First Battalion of Free Men of Color broke into a rendition of "En avan' Grenadie," a Creole song set to the tune of "La Marseillaise."[59] In the early 1850s, when a dying nativism and a growing Irish Catholic community nearly erased French from New Orleans religious life, dozens of *gens de couleur*, including François Lacroix, left the church but remained pious through séances and spiritualist meetings.[60] They were unwilling to give up their culture—the root of the "nation" that bound them together but something that appeared to outsiders as anything but "American."

This may, then, explain why none of the sixteen freeborn Louisianans who went to Liberia had French surnames, practiced Catholicism, or appeared in any francophone records. They were the types of people the LCS had any hope of attracting. They were the ones with a sense of national origin fixed in the American past, the dream of racial rebirth and cultural expansion seen in Joseph Roberts's inaugural address. They were the "pilgrims" of Liberia and the rejects of America. The *gens de couleur*—the men who sang "En avan' Grenadie" and ever sought a "better fit"—wanted to survive. They wanted to sustain their way of life, not prove how American they could be in a new land. If we look at colonization and removal from the bottom up, both socially and geographically, we start to see that Liberia was but one option for a certain type of person. The colonization movement, though rife with political and ideological drama, was at its most fundamental level a social and cultural movement. If we begin to look at it that way, we can start to rethink not only the presumed failure of Liberian colonization and "black removal" in general but also the very existence of a targeted "free black" aggregate.

The men and women of color discussed here, nearly all of whom chose to leave and fit into their communities on a social level that betrays the standard narrative of universal physical and legal oppression, traveled in different di-

rections toward the same end. The dream of belonging, of constructing and protecting definitions of citizenship under which people of color from similar backgrounds and social statuses could live in peace, drove ideas of removal and colonization in both Virginia and Louisiana. The two camps simply used different words and roots to describe their plans. By seeking a nation of their own, whether on American soil, on the West African coast, or within the Mexican Republic, middle-class men and women of color across the South took part in a debate over the representation and meaning of nationhood in the Atlantic world. The idea of emigration, whether through an agency like the ACS or as a result of individual will, served as a conduit through which people of color could lay claim to the same sense of liberation and rebirth that defined the American historical and legal imagination, only this time in their own terms.

Lacroix and Lanusse were not culturally "American," and neither were those who left New Orleans for Mexico and Haiti. They had no interest in creating an American nation for themselves on a distant coast, nor did they care much about those who did. But for a brief moment, over the course of nearly thirty years, each of them joined the conversation Joseph Roberts and his Americo-Liberians had started. For Lacroix, it came in the 1830s; for Lanusse, Fouché, and Desdunes, it came later and ultimately led to action. But at each of those singular moments, free people of color in New Orleans merged with the larger African American population of the United States in their interest and curiosity about life outside of home. For more than a century, francophone, Catholic mixed-race New Orleanians had worked to create a space of belonging and legitimacy—social, racial, or both—in a city far different from but quickly assimilating into the American political and cultural body. And when threatened, the same visions of commercial expansion, social legitimacy, and nationhood that drove Joseph Roberts and his fellow Virginians to the West African coast likewise drove Lacroix, Lanusse, Fouché, and their associates to dream of similar success. In the end, Lacroix stayed and Roberts left, but for all the same reasons.

NOTES

1. The terminology of race within the Atlantic realm and indeed within U.S. history is fraught with uncertainty and active debate. A growing body of scholarship has made clear the shortcomings of an antiquated binary race code splitting complex and diverse communities into "black" and "white" with little or nothing in between. I have chosen to use the somewhat controversial term *colored* to describe those men and women who did not identify as "black" or functionally of African descent within the United States. In many cases, law painted these people as one or the other, but they identified with

and lived their lives according to cultural roots that complicated and even betrayed the legal and social archetypes attached to such terms. In several instances, members of this community, who tended to be remarkably conscious of their collective racial identity, used the term *colored* to describe their specific relationships to "Negroes" and "blacks." As a result, I use this term purely within its historical context to identify members of a community who fell outside the legal binary of race in the nineteenth-century Atlantic world and who did not fit the more well-defined racial hierarchy of the Spanish Sistema de Castas and its Atlantic derivatives. For specific uses of the term *colored*, see "Petition of F. Edgar Lacroix," n.d., no. 9,804, Succession of François Lacroix, Civil District Court, New Orleans Public Library (hereafter NOPL). For works that discuss the terminology of racially liminal people in the Atlantic world, see Jennifer M. Spear, *Race, Sex, and Social Order in Early New Orleans* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2009), 14–16; Julie Winch, *The Clamorgans: One Family's History of Race in America* (New York: Hill & Wang, 2011), chaps. 5, 7; Eva Sheppard Wolf, *Race and Liberty in the New Nation: Emancipation in Virginia from the Revolution to Nat Turner's Rebellion* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2009), 1–7. The political and legal debates surrounding colonization have received growing academic coverage since the first decade of the twenty-first century. For the oldest and possibly most influential treatment, see P. J. Staudenraus, *The African Colonization Movement, 1816–1865* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1961). Among the more recent treatments, the most notable are Eric Burin, *Slavery and the Peculiar Solution: A History of the American Colonization Society* (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2005); Claude A. Clegg III, *The Price of Liberty: African Americans and the Making of Liberia* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2004); Marie Tyler-McGraw, *An African Republic: Black and White Virginians in the Making of Liberia* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2007); Beverly C. Tomek, *Colonization and Its Discontents: Emancipation, Emigration, and Antislavery in Antebellum Pennsylvania* (New York: New York University Press, 2011).

2. The number of legal terms used to describe free people of color and freedmen in state law is enormous. The most common term used was *free Negroes*. On the language of race in American law, see Andrew N. Wegmann, "The Vitriolic Blood of a Negro: The Development of Racial Identity and Creole Elitism in New Spain and Spanish Louisiana, 1763–1803," *Journal of Transatlantic Studies* 13, no. 2 (June 2015): 213–19; Ariela Gross, *What Blood Won't Tell: A History of Race on Trial in America* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2008), chaps. 2, 4; Eva Sheppard Wolf, *Almost Free: A Story about Family and Race in Antebellum Virginia* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2012), 36–42; Spear, *Race, Sex, and Social Order*, chap. 7.

3. On the fear of free people of color, see, among others, Burin, *Slavery and the Peculiar Solution*, 7–10; Wolf, *Race and Liberty*, 115–20, 130–43; Ira Berlin, *Slaves without Masters: The Free Negro in the Antebellum South* (New York: Pantheon, 1974), 79–198; H. E. Sterkx, *The Free Negro in Ante-Bellum Louisiana* (Rutherford, N.J.: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 1972), 215–20, 285–93.

4. Thomas Jefferson, *Notes of the State of Virginia*, ed. Frank Shuffelton (1785; New York: Penguin, 1999), 144–45. On Jefferson and colonization, see also Peter S. Onuf, *Jefferson's Empire: The Language of American Nationhood* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 2000), chap. 5.

5. *National Intelligencer*, December 18, 1816. See also Staudenraus, *African Colonization Movement*, 30–33; Tyler-McGraw, *African Republic*, 60–61; Mathew Carey, *Letters on African Colonization; with a View of Its Probable Results* (Philadelphia: Young, 1832), 2–3, 17–18.

6. "The Meeting on the Colonization of Free Blacks," *Albany Register*, January 10, 1817.

7. The ACS existed from 1816 to 1964, when, all but forgotten, it disbanded and donated its voluminous papers to the Library of Congress. The ACS was most active during the 1820s and 1830s and experienced a resurgence from the 1850s through 1880s. Its West African colony, Liberia, founded in 1822, received more than thirteen thousand African Americans during those decades, and it remains an independent republic today. Scholarship on Liberia after its independence in 1847 is scanty. See Andrew N. Wegmann, "'Upon This Rock We Shall Build Our Homes': The Development of the Americo-Liberian Community, 1822–1980," in *Back to Africa: The Ideology and Practice of African Returnee Phenomenon*, ed. Kwesi Prah (Johannesburg: CASAS, 2012), 60–77; James Ciment, *Another America: The Story of Liberia and the Former Slaves Who Ruled It* (New York: Hill and Wang, 2013), chaps. 6–10.

8. A recent academic wave has pushed the ACS to the fringes of antebellum politics and society. See most recently Ousmane K. Power-Greene, *Against Wind and Tide: The African American Struggle against the Colonization Movement* (New York: New York University Press, 2014). See also Tomek, *Colonization and Its Discontents*; Ciment, *Another America*, chaps. 1–4; Amy S. Greenberg, *Manifest Manhood and the Antebellum American Empire* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 45–50; Daniel Walker Howe, *What Hath God Wrought: The Transformation of America, 1815–1848* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), 262–66; James Horton and Lois Horton, *In Hope of Liberty: Culture, Community, and Protest among Northern Free Blacks, 1700–1860* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997), 177–202. Several notable and welcome exceptions are Floyd J. Miller, *The Search for a Black Nationality: Black Emigration and Colonization, 1787–1863* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1975); Ted Maris-Wolf, *Family Bonds: Free Blacks and Re-Enslavement Law in Antebellum Virginia* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2015), chaps. 1, 5; Robert P. Murray, "Whiteness in Africa: Americo-Liberians and the Transformative Geographies of Race" (PhD diss., University of Kentucky, 2013), chap. 2.

9. Massachusetts Colonization Society, *Sixth Annual Report of the Board of Managers of the Massachusetts Colonization Society* (Boston: Marvin, 1847), 9–11; David Walker, *David Walker's Appeal to the Coloured Citizens of the World*, ed. Peter Hinks (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2000), xxiii.

10. The ACS used this phrase in nearly every publication it released. For a particularly interesting example, see "The Separation of the Two Races, Necessary to Their

Mutual Happiness," *Thirty-First Annual Report of the American Colonization Society* (Washington, D.C.: Alexander, 1848), 22–23.

11. Wegmann, "'Upon This Rock,'" 60–67; Ciment, *Another America*, chaps. 6–10.

12. "President Roberts' Inaugural Address," *African Repository and Colonial Journal* 45 (1848): 121.

13. Ibid., 124.

14. On the growth of republicanism in Liberia and the United States, see Carl Patrick Burrowes, "Black Christian Republicanism: A Southern Ideology in Early Liberia, 1822 to 1847," *Journal of Negro History* 86, no. 1 (Winter 2001): 30–44; Wegmann, "'Upon This Rock,'" 60–77.

15. See most recently Nicholas Guyatt, "'The Outskirts of Our Happiness': Race and the Lure of Colonization in the Early Republic," *Journal of American History* 95, no. 4 (March 2009): 987–90. See also John Saillant, "The American Enlightenment in Africa: Jefferson's Colonization and Black Virginians' Migration to Liberia, 1776–1840," *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 31, no. 3 (Spring 1998): 261–82; Tyler-McGraw, *African Republic*, 107–16; Burin, *Slavery and the Peculiar Solution*, chap. 2; James H. Kettner, *The Development of American Citizenship, 1608–1870* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1978), chap. 10.

16. Thomas Jefferson was outspoken in his defense of European superiority. See Jefferson, *Notes*, 144–48; Bruce Dain, *A Hideous Monster of the Mind: American Race Theory in the Early Republic* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2002), chap. 1.

17. See James T. Campbell, *Middle Passages: African-American Journeys to Africa, 1787–2005* (New York: Penguin, 2006), 140–44; Staudenraus, *African Colonization Movement*, chap. 1; Guyatt, "'Outskirts of Our Happiness,'" 987–88, 992–94; Tyler-McGraw, *African Republic*, 5–7, 105–10.

18. Most literature concerning colonization focuses on the Upper South and New England, rarely exploring any farther south than Virginia. This approach is not necessarily intentional, however. The ACS and other auxiliaries of the colonization movement were most active and left the most wide-ranging paper trail in Virginia, Pennsylvania, and New York. Maryland started its own colonization society and colony in West Africa, and the ACS was based in Washington, D.C. Very few auxiliary units sustained life below Virginia. See Tyler-McGraw, *African Republic*; Staudenraus, *African Colonization Movement*; Burin, *Slavery and the Peculiar Solution*; Tomek, *Colonization and Its Discontents*; James Sidbury, *Becoming African in America: Race and Nation in the Early Black Atlantic* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), chap. 7; Ira Berlin, *The Making of African America: The Four Great Migrations* (New York: Viking, 2010), 207–17. The few exceptions include Clegg, *Price of Liberty*, which focuses on North Carolina; Kenneth C. Barnes, *Journey of Hope: The Back-to-Africa Movement in Arkansas in the Late 1800s* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2004).

19. "Explication," *L'Union*, October 8, 1862; "Estate of M. Sélingy & Miss Brouard," vol. 31, no. 841, Records of Achille Chiapella, Notary, New Orleans Notarial Archive, New Orleans. For more on how New Orleans colored society remembered Lanusse, see

Rodolphe Lucien Desdunes, *Our People and Our History: Fifty Creole Portraits*, ed. and trans. Sister Dorothea Olga McCants (1911; Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1973), 10–17.

20. The phrase "elite of his people," or, more specifically, "elite of our people," comes from Joseph Willson, *The Elite of Our People: Joseph Willson's Sketches of Black Upper-Class Life in Antebellum Philadelphia*, ed. Julie Winch (1841; University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2000). The phrase also appears, although less prominently, in Cyprian Clamorgan, *The Colored Aristocracy of St. Louis*, ed. Julie Winch (1858; Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1999).

21. "Explication," *L'Union*, October 8, 1862. Also cited in Rebecca J. Scott and Jean M. Hébrard, *Freedom Papers: An Atlantic Odyssey in the Age of Emancipation* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2012), 121–22.

22. "Maximilien de Mexique," *L'Union*, July 12, 1864.

23. François Lacroix to Etienne Cordeviolle, June 18, 1839, no. 3,744, Succession of Etienne Cordeviolle, Civil District Court, NOPL.

24. "Testimony of François Lacroix," October 2, 1841, *Cordeviolle & Lacroix v. Evariste Wiltz*, Succession of François Lacroix.

25. See Succession of Joseph Dumas, 1880, no. 41,664, Succession of Joseph Dumas, Wife, 1881, no. 41,812, both in Second District Court, NOPL.

26. See Succession of Julien Colvis, 1869, no. 32,714, Second District Court, NOPL; Succession of Bernard Soulié, 1882, no. 8,029, Civil District Court, NOPL; Soulié Family Ledgers, vol. 2, Historic New Orleans Collection. For more on Erasme Legoaster, see Loren Schweninger, *Black Property Owners in the South, 1790–1915* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1990), 101–2.

27. These numbers come primarily from Tom W. Shick, comp. and ed., *Roll of Emigrants to Liberia between 1820 and 1843*, http://www.disc.wisc.edu/archive/Liberia/index.html; *ACS Database*, in possession of Eric Burin of the University of North Dakota.

28. See "Gale, Ely," Square 3, Second Municipality, Early Assessment Records of New Orleans, 1841, vol. 5, NOPL; New Orleans City Directory, 1839, p. 144, NOPL; Shick, *Roll of Emigrants*.

29. Gale never appears in any ledger books, successions, court proceedings, or notarial acts involving any of these wealthy colored men or any of those with whom they had regular interaction. See Successions of François Lacroix, Etienne Cordeviolle, Bernard Soulié, Julien Colvis, and Joseph Dumas as well as the Soulié Family Ledgers, Historic New Orleans Collection. The only biographical information on Gale comes from *Ely Gale v. Moses Quick*, 1831, no. 5,596, Orleans Parish Court, NOPL.

30. Sylvia Gale appears in a single record, where she is recorded as "Gale, Sylvia—50, mulatto, seamstress, freeborn, N.O." ("Mayor's Office: Register of Free Coloured Persons," 1840, vol. 1, NOPL).

31. Only three published works provide any meaningful information on the LCS. None of them focus on or even consider the opinions of the target free colored community. See Timothy F. Reilly, "The Louisiana Colonization Society and the Protestant

Missionary, 1830–1860," *Louisiana History* 43, no. 4 (Autumn 2002): 433–77; William A. Poe, "A Look at Louisiana Colonization in Its African Setting," *Louisiana Studies* 11, no. 2 (Summer 1972): 111–24; Charles S. Sydnor, *Slavery in Mississippi* (1933; Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1966), chap. 4.

32. New Orleans had eleven newspapers during those years, and ACS and LCS ads appeared in all of them, including the three French-language periodicals (*Courrier de la Louisiane*, *La Gazette d'État de la Louisiane*, and *L'Union*), which ran for a combined period of eight years. Nearly every extant issue of these papers is housed at Howard-Tilton Library, Special Collections, Tulane University, and NOPL.

33. "Report of the American Colonization Society," *Niles' Weekly Register*, June 30, 1835.

34. *African Repository and Colonial Journal* 7 (1836): 336.

35. See Leonard P. Curry, *The Free Black in Urban America, 1800–1850* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981), 250, table A-7.

36. *Information Relative to the Operations of the United States Squadron on the West Coast of Africa, the Condition of the American Colonies There, and the Commerce of the United States Therewith*, 28th Cong., 2nd sess., S. Doc. 150, Serial 458; Tyler-McGraw, *African Republic*, 70–71; John Henderson Russell, *The Free Negro in Virginia, 1619–1865* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1913), 14.

37. *Information Relative to the Operations*; Shick, *Roll of Emigrants*; Tom W. Shick, *Behold the Promised Land: A History of Afro-American Settler Society in Nineteenth-Century Liberia* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1980), 112–13.

38. See "Register of Free Negroes & Mulattoes, 1794–1819," Petersburg, mf 47, "Registry of Free Negroes & Mulattoes, Made & Entered in the Clerk's Office of the Hustings Court of the Town of Petersburg, 1819–1833," mf 73, "Petersburg Personal Property Tax List, 1800–1833," mf 360, all in Virginia State University Special Collections, Petersburg. More than 80 percent of the recorded emigrants appeared in the "Registers of Free Negroes & Mulattoes" as "mulatto," "yellow," "light brown," or "light complexion."

39. Joseph Jenkins, "Joseph Jenkins Roberts: The Father of Liberia, Son of Petersburg," unpublished ms, Joseph Jenkins Papers, Box 1, Folder 8, Virginia State University Special Collections.

40. The best treatment of Colson remains Luther P. Jackson, "Free Negroes in Petersburg, Virginia," *Journal of Negro History* 12, no. 3 (July 1927): 373–77. See also L. Diane Barnes, *Artisan Workers in the Upper South: Petersburg, Virginia, 1820–1865* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2008), 135–36; Juliet E. K. Walker, *The History of Black Business in America: Capitalism, Race, Entrepreneurship* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2009), 1:154–55.

41. "Ledger of Expences [*sic*]," 1827, House of Roberts and Colson Papers, Box 21, Folder 2, Virginia State University Special Collections. The net profit split between Roberts and Colson was $9,801.84.

42. "Sales and Sundry Articles, Merchandise and Expences [*sic*] of Roberts, Colson, & Co.," December 9, 1828, House of Roberts and Colson Papers, Box 21, Folder 9. For

Colson's ownership of slaves, see "Petersburg Personal Property Tax List, 1800–1833," 137, 452.

43. "Merchandise Held," January 8, 1829, House of Roberts and Colson Papers, Box 21, Folder 9; "Newspaper Advertisement" (photocopy), n.d., Jenkins Papers, Box 1, Folder 7. For an example of Lacroix's advertisements, see *Crescent City Business Directory for 1858–1859* (New Orleans: Hammond, 1858), 113.

44. See "Ledger of Expences [*sic*]," 1827, House of Roberts and Colson Papers, Box 21, Folder 2; "Sales and Sundry Articles, Merchandise and Expences [*sic*] of Roberts, Colson, & Co.," December 9, 1828, House of Roberts and Colson Papers, Box 21, Folder 9. Roberts, Colson, and Company did business with both Cooper (a tobacconist) and Payne (a leather craftsman and shoemaker).

45. This is an emerging view in the study of free colored populations in the South. For the most recent and most convincing case, see Kirt von Daacke, *Freedom Has a Face: Race, Identity, and Community in Jefferson's Virginia* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2012). In the case of New Orleans, especially before the Louisiana Purchase, see Spear, *Race, Sex, and Social Order*.

46. The House of Roberts and Colson Papers are littered with letters sent back and forth between the two proprietors. On Roberts's travel to the United States on business, see "Memorandum Book," 1833–42, House of Roberts and Colson Papers, Box 21, Folder 12.

47. Material on Payne and Yates is scanty. See Alexander Crummell, "The Progress and Prospects of the Republic of Liberia," in *Destiny and Race: Selected Writings, 1840–1898*, ed. Wilson Jeremiah Moses (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1992), 168–69; *African Repository and Colonial Journal* 34 (1858): 132; D. Elwood Dunn, Amos J. Beyan, and Carl Patrick Burrowes, *Historical Dictionary of Liberia*, 2nd ed. (Lanham, Md.: Scarecrow, 2001), 259.

48. Joseph Jenkins Roberts, Stephen Benson, Daniel Warner, James Spriggs Payne, Nathaniel Brander (who died early in Roberts's first term), Anthony Williams, Beverly Yates, James Priest, and Joseph Gibson all appear in the Roberts, Colson, and Company ledger books as well as in U.S. newspapers announcing shipments and transactions across the Eastern Seaboard, especially Richmond, Norfolk, Baltimore, and Charleston. See "Receipts, Postage, and Dues," 1830–50, House of Roberts and Colson Papers, Box 21, Folder 18; *Southern Patriot* (Charleston), May 6, 1836; *Sun* (Baltimore), January 25, 1853; *Charleston Mercury*, September 13, 1856.

49. This is a common observation about Americo-Liberian society as a whole. See Shick, *Behold the Promised Land*, 42–60; Wegmann, "'Upon This Rock,'" 63–66.

50. See "Testimony of Mrs. Sarah Lacroix," May 29, 1876, "Testimony of Elizabeth Garcia," n.d., "Testimony of Julia Torregrossa," July 26, 1876, all in Succession of François Lacroix. He had three sons with his wife, Cécile Édouary—Victor, François Edgar, and Joseph. Victor married a white woman, Sarah Brown, who claimed that she did not know that Victor was a man of color at the time of their marriage because his "complection was as fair as mine" ("Testimony of Mrs. Sarah Lacroix").

51. Although François Edgar described his father as having "passed in society" as a man of color, François Lacroix was indeed of mixed race, claiming only a "white" complexion. His mother, Anne Batecave Lacroix, was a *mulâtre* native of Saint-Domingue. Her husband and François's father, Jean Lacroix, was a relatively wealthy white Frenchman who lived most of his life in Saint-Domingue before leaving, with his wife and one child, for Cuba in the midst of the Haitian Revolution. See "François Lacroix avec Cécile Édouary," no. 99, *Register des Mariages pour les Personnes de Couleur de la Paroisse de St. Louis*, in Succession of François Lacroix. For François Edgar's quotes, see "Petition of F. Edgar Lacroix," n.d., Succession of François Lacroix.

52. François Lacroix to "Cordeviolle, Famille," February 12, 1862, Succession of Etienne Cordeviolle. The final line appears in the original as "Nous sommes tous bien. Nous sommes tous contentes." The repeated allusions to his emotional state are in response to Cordeviolle's question, "How are things in New Orleans? We have heard the port no longer moves. I must admit I worry" (Etienne Cordeviolle to François Lacroix, September 9, 1861, Succession of Etienne Cordeviolle).

53. See *Documens Relatif à la Colonie d'Eureka dans l'État de Veracruz, République Mexicaine* (New Orleans: Mérider, 1857), Louisiana Research Center, Howard-Tilton Library, Special Collections, Tulane University.

54. "Communiqué," *L'Union*, July 19, 1864. Also cited in Scott and Hébrard, *Freedom Papers*, 122.

55. *Documens Relatif*, 4–5.

56. Scholars have all but ignored Fouché's Eureka colony and the buildup to its founding. See Caryn Cossé Bell, *Revolution, Romanticism, and the Afro-Creole Protest Tradition in Louisiana, 1718–1868* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1997), 85–87; Sidney J. Lemelle, "The 'Circum-Caribbean' and the Continuity of Cultures: The Donato Colony in Mexico, 1830–1860," *Journal of Pan African Studies* 6, no. 1 (July 2013): 57–75.

57. Lemelle, "'Circum-Caribbean' and the Continuity of Cultures," 65.

58. See Bell, *Revolution*, 86–87; Desdunes, *Our People and Our History*, 112–13.

59. See Eileen Southern, *The Music of Black Americans: A History* (New York: Norton, 1971), 66; Nina Monroe, *Bayou Ballads* (New York: Schirmer, 1921), 30; Charles E. Kinzer, "The Tio Family: Four Generations of New Orleans Musicians, 1814–1933" (PhD diss., Louisiana State University, 1993), 60–61; Sybil Kein, "The Use of Louisiana Creole in Southern Literature," in *Creole: The History and Legacy of Louisiana's Free People of Color*, ed. Kein (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2000), 120–21.

60. See "Cahier No. 2," 1857–68, René Grandjean Collection, Earl K. Long Library Special Collections, University of New Orleans. See also Bell, *Revolution*, 187–90.

Exiles in America

Canadian Anti-Black Racism and the Meaning of Nation in the Age of the 1848 Revolutions

IKUKO ASAKA

In 1856, a young woman gave a speech at a literary society in the town of Chatham, located in present-day southwestern Ontario.[1] The speaker, "Miss L. Gilcrease," defended the presence of the self-emancipated people whose growing visibility in the area had roused intense anti-black sentiment among white settlers. Her defense was twofold. First, Gilcrease cast former-slave refugees in a patriotic light, associating them with monarchal loyalty—a willingness to "show to the natives of this country that we intend to honor the Queen's country, and have sworn allegiance to Her, and we will seal our destinies with our own blood if required." Second, Gilcrease equated these refugees with political exiles from Eastern Europe, describing both groups as oppressed "nations" who had escaped to more benign governments.

The speech began with an enumeration of "nations [who] are now groaning and praying to be delivered from the galling yoke of despots." Proclaimed Gilcrease, "Poland, Hungary, the serfs of Russia and the African slave of America are these very people." Of those "groaning" souls, "millions are impatient to wait [their] redemption" and "therefore emigrate to those lands where more liberal laws exist." Indeed, torrents of refugees flowed from Eastern Europe and the United States, although it is not clear whether Gilcrease intended to include in those "millions" Russian radical intellectuals such as Nicholas Turgenev and Alexander Herzen, who lived in exile to elude state repression for their opposition to serfdom.[2] Certainly more recognizable was the analogy between the substantial numbers of Polish and Hungarian political exiles who took refuge in England in the wake of the so-called Revolutions of 1848 and self-emancipated fugitives who arrived in Canada to find shelter in "a place of refuge where the avenger of Blood will no more harass us."[3] The message of Gilcrease's talk seemed to resonate well with her audience, for it was later printed in the *Provincial Freeman*, the Canadian newspaper founded and edited by black migrants from the United States.

Gilcrease's speech derived its meaning from the volatile and mobile world of the 1850s. By the time she spoke, discourses had circulated in Canada, England, and the United States that offered an interpretive framework in which she and her audiences could have made sense of the address. Three specific motifs had entered the abolitionist lexicon by the 1850s: equating the fugitive slave to the European political exile, referring to Canada as "a place of refuge," and labeling formerly enslaved people a nation and African. These themes might very well have set the parameters within which the black literary public inscribed and interpreted the speech. Highlighting the cultural milieu in which Gilcrease spoke does not necessarily mean that her audiences construed the speech in this context, nor does it prove that Gilcrease had been exposed to these motifs prior to writing her piece. But this approach does shine a light on the broad cultural conditions that might have shaped the writing and reception of the speech, foreground the confluences of revolutionary fervor and the intensifying drive for black exclusion, and elucidate the multifarious meanings of *nation* that developed against this political backdrop and informed African Canadians' political expression in mid-nineteenth-century Canada.

Black abolitionists' invocation of the European political exiles has received much scholarly attention and constitutes a subtheme in literature on U.S. abolitionists' engagement with the epochal events of 1848. R. J. M. Blackett has demonstrated that African American activists saw parallels between the fight against slavery and Hungary's struggle against Austrian absolutism and consequently sought to harness the popularity and prominence of Hungarian exile Lajos Kossuth, who undertook an American tour in 1851. However, such efforts failed to elicit an antislavery statement from Kossuth, who refused to involve himself in what he characterized as domestic political issues.[4] Black abolitionists in the United States also used the revolutions of 1848 as rhetorical strategies. According to Erica L. Ball, they laid bare the hypocrisy of white Americans who sympathized with the plight of the Hungarians under tyrannical imperial rule but showed no sympathy for the "American Hungarian" in bondage.[5] Centering on the Garrisonian faction, W. Caleb McDaniel has argued that radical abolitionists resorted to a "shaming" tactic, reproaching white Americans who enthusiastically welcomed "fugitive Kossuth" during his visit yet supported the new Fugitive Slave Law of 1850.[6]

What has received less attention in this literature are abolitionist narratives that likened fugitives from European despotism to those fleeing from southern slavery to Canada. Such writings appeared in both U.S. and Canadian publications, though they emerged earlier and in more substantial numbers in the United States. In the U.S. antislavery press, the equation of the two types of fu-

gitives catered to a particular abolitionist goal: bringing to light the incongruity of white Americans' views on Kossuth and on the Fugitive Slave Law, which forced fugitive slaves and their supporters into exile in Canada. This body of narratives and its Canadian variation, which targeted the anti-black racism of white Canadians, functioned differently as a political tool, reflecting the two places' distinct concerns about race relations. Nonetheless, the circulation of the rhetoric on both sides of the border gestures toward the flow of abolitionist vocabulary across borders and its local appropriation, which in turn influenced the cultural conditions within which Gilcrease honed her political creative acumen.

Gilcrease's engagement with the revolutionary theme in Canada for a distinctly Canadian political end compels us to reframe the geographic sphere of what McDaniel calls "transatlantic debates about democracy, slavery, and nationalism," which linked the United States and the tumultuous Europe of the mid-nineteenth century rattled by political uprisings stretching from France to Hungary.[7] These debates spread to Canada and led to the articulation of a black political sensibility that entailed rhetorical strategies and a set of meanings particular to discussions of race and nation within the British Empire.

As for the two remaining motifs, Gilcrease's reference to the province as "a place of refuge" for American slaves had a precursor in the metropole, where calling Canada the "city of refuge" for fugitive slaves had gained currency and resonance against the backdrop of England's self-valorization as the asylum for European refugees. Further, classifying European groups and formerly enslaved people into different "nations" and identifying the latter as "African" had been a tactic pro-black Toronto newspapers used to challenge white colonists who drew racial boundaries to distinguish members of Canadian settler society from nonmembers.

The third motif warrants additional explanation, for it helps to resolve an apparent contradiction in Gilcrease's speech: What logic was at work when Gilcrease, who asserted the loyalty of the nation of "the African slave of America" to "the Queen's country," simultaneously equated this nation with European nationalist groups that embraced the ideal of territorialized, independent sovereignty? The key to answering this question lies in the diverse and locally contingent usages of the word *nation* across the Atlantic world during this time. In Canadian settings, nationalizing black newcomers as African had happened outside the discursive context of the European revolutions but within a paradigm of nation that undergirded an effort to broaden the definition of the Canadian settler subject. This paradigm, rooted in the Romantic system of differentiation and classifying people along the lines of nationality as opposed to a black/white dichotomy, was put forth by white journalists in Toronto who

assumed national difference as the basis of categorization and cast the Canadian settler community as an assembly of disparate nations, including those of African, Scottish, Irish, English, French, and German origins. Within this context, *nation* attained particular meaning specific to Canadian discursive settings and became doubly useful in claiming self-emancipated people's settler status as well as in effecting strategic identification with the persecuted nationalist Europeans.

Canada provided a backdrop for U.S. abolitionist comparisons between the European fugitive from despotic monarchs and the American fugitive from the tyrannical Slave Power. One of the main functions of this analogy was to expose the hypocrisy of those Americans who sympathized with Kossuth's exile while championing the Fugitive Slave Law that drove formerly enslaved refugees across the northern border. In 1849, a reader in Fort Wayne, Indiana, wrote to the abolitionist *National Era*, based in Washington, D.C., about his country's double standard on fugitive issues. If Canada were annexed by the United States, he opined, "many Kossuths there . . . who have escaped from worse than Austrian bondage across the border" would be caught "with bloodhound and bayonet" and immediately sent back to slavery. The author then asked sarcastically, "Suppose Kossuth were to think of escaping and flying to Canadian shores, were it not best he received a friendly caution" about annexation? The answer should be no. The United States would not request his extradition, for "Christendom has professed to be much shocked" with the idea of the Russian "Autocrat Nicholas" demanding "the noble Hungarian fugitive" who had fled the tsar's suppression of the Hungarian uprising.[8] A similar argument reappeared in the *National Era* four years later when the paper chided the local *Washington Union* for condemning an effort in London to provide aid to fugitive slaves in Canada. After the *Union* declared that the adoption of "measures . . . to raise funds for the relief of fugitive slaves of the South, who usually reach the Canadas," was "inconsistent with the obligations of international justice and comity," the abolitionist paper pointed out that the *Union* had expressed no similar objections to the U.S. government's honoring of Kossuth and other "Austrian fugitives" who had rebelled against state authority and thus undercut diplomatic accord between the United States and Britain.[9]

American abolitionists' invocations of Kossuth and Canada also concerned black activists who had fled to the British province for violating the Fugitive Slave Law's provision against interference in the arrest of fugitive slaves. In 1852, *Frederick Douglass' Paper* published a letter by Jermain Loguen, a formerly enslaved abolitionist who had previously lived in Syracuse but had departed for Canada to avoid indictment for obstructing the Fugitive Slave Law. In October

1851, Loguen and other members of the Syracuse Vigilance Committee rescued a fugitive, William "Jerry" Henry, from federal authorities and helped him escape to Kingston, Canada. Loguen, the committee's vice-chair, and committee member Samuel Ringgold Ward soon thereafter followed Henry to Canada. Loguen bemoaned the contrast between the celebration of Kossuth and the unjust treatment that Loguen and his "poor brethren" had received from the same people: "What hypocrites the people of the United States are showing themselves now to be!" Distraught and in a foreign country, he lamented "the meanness of the American people," who valorized "the great man Kossuth" but forced Loguen to separate from his "poor family" and made him "an exile."[10] Another U.S. abolitionist similarly wrote to *Frederick Douglass' Paper*, "We are greatly troubled that such noble Kossuths as Ward and Loguen, should be hunted from our country." Brought to light was the bigotry of the contrasting treatment of Kossuth and of the black abolitionists in which the noble deed of the crusaders against the oppressive Slave Power met with persecution by the same people who championed Kossuth's fight against despotism.[11]

Interwoven in all these representations was the conviction that fugitives from U.S. slavery should really be in the United States. This assumption found a more direct articulation in a speech by Wendell Phillips, an eminent white Garrisonian abolitionist. He expressed indignation that the Fugitive Slave Law had disrupted "the domestic firesides of hundreds of fugitive slaves, who had been happy at the North for ten, fifteen, aye, twenty years," and forced them to become "exiles by going to Canada or even to England." Their ordeal was particularly odious because it had been concocted by "the very men who have welcomed the great Hungarian to this country."[12]

The popular abolitionist narrative likening the two types of refugees subsequently appeared in a Canadian newspaper but addressed issues specific to the province. In 1855, a few years after the U.S. versions of the comparison began appearing, the *Provincial Freeman* called out "ye *hollow-hearted* folks of the Province of Canada" who "do . . . not despise the Hon. Lewis Kossuth, as ye do the eloquent Rev. Samuel R. Ward" even though "both are *fugitives* from oppression." In the author's view, the only difference between the two was that "one is from the 'Old World,' and the other from the 'New' . . . one wears a *white* skin, and the other wears a *black* one!"[13]

Black abolitionists in Canada also highlighted the metropole's self-congratulatory image as a haven for European revolutionaries. As the only European country that did not restrict the entrance or residence of foreigners (with the exception of the short-lived Alien Act of 1848), England had offered asylum to more European exiles than did any other country.[14] The Hungarians

arrived in England mostly in 1851 after being trapped in Turkey during their escape from the Austrian-Habsburg and Russian tsarist troops that suppressed Hungary's 1849 attempt to achieve independence.[15] Poles, in contrast, arrived in waves that corresponded to the failures of the November Uprising of 1831, the Cracow Uprising in 1846, the revolutions of 1848, and the January Uprising in 1864.[16]

England's willingness to grant asylum to the Eastern European groups as well as to French and German revolutionaries led the metropolitan public to perceive their country as the leading place of refuge for the displaced Europeans.[17] In 1853, the *British Banner* published an article, "The City of Refuge," that took its title from an expression that had a long history of symbolic use and had gained popularity amid the turmoil. The article proclaimed England the "City of Refuge for all sorts of political exiles on the Continent," "offering hospitality to strangers in distress" without making "inquiries as to rank or station, or as to views, whether political or religious." Rather, "it was enough for England that their lives were in peril in their native land, and that they looked to her for succor."[18] The same year, according to the *London Times*, "Every civilized people on the face of the earth must be fully aware that this country is the *asylum of nations*, and that it will defend the asylum to the last ounce of its treasure, and the last drop of its blood."[19] In 1852, a member of Parliament had boasted that "the pleasure and happiness every Englishman feels in knowing that his country affords the refugee a home and safety" was tantamount to "the pleasure and happiness of a refugee, hunted from his native land, on approaching on the shores of England."[20]

Deeply anchored in a spirit of self-glorification, newspapers in the metropole and Canada extended the sphere of Britain's city of refuge to Canada, opening arms to another group of exiles, fugitive slaves. In the aftermath of the Fugitive Slave Law, a *British Banner* article, "The Cities of Refuge," claimed that "from the days of Moses to our own, no places have, we think, better deserved the title of 'Cities of Refuge,' than the Canadian towns on the shores of Lake Ontario at the present moment."[21] A poem, "My Canada, I'll Love Thee Best," appeared in a Canadian newspaper, lauding the colony for its benevolence as a "refuge of wanderer and slave" and "Savior of Afric's bleeding child."[22]

Playing to the metropole's celebratory self-perception made strategic sense to some black residents of Canada, not least because the province was far from a "place of refuge" for them. Josiah Henson, a formerly enslaved author and activist now living in Canada, sought to bring home to the metropole that Canada was nowhere close to its reputation as a place of asylum. Speaking at the Congregational Union in London, Henson deplored the racial prejudice in

Canada, which was "blighting the happiness of his fellow countrymen, women, and children, there." His criticism surprised Londoners, who had genuinely believed in Canada's eminence as a shelter for the enslaved. According to one attendee, "It came like a shock upon the Assembly, that a land which England has been accustomed to boast of as a city of refuge, should, after all, be a city of cribs, and pens, harsh exemptions, and cruel exclusions."[23]

Gilcrease's speech reflected the same spirit: both she and Henson appealed to Britain's self-congratulatory reputation. But Gilcrease went a step further, drawing a direct parallel between the cross-border escape from slavery and the European exiles' flight from violent and despotic oppression. Capitalizing on the European revolutionaries' importance to the British public as "a source of considerable national pride," Gilcrease urged the extension of their benevolent reception to another group of desperate refugees.[24]

Moreover, her speech not only represented self-emancipated people as deserving of the empire's sympathy and support but reclassified them as a "national" group in a quest of shelter under British jurisdiction, just like the European nationalists. This identification by no means conceived the black refugees as a nation of people in pursuit of territorialized independent sovereignty. On the contrary, the concept of nation in this particular case appealed for colonial inclusion. Its meaning was anchored in a contest over who were the legitimate members of Canadian colonial settlerhood and which system of classification should determine membership in that group—a black/white racial dualism or the Romantic mode of national differentiation. Situated at the crossroads of divergent concepts of nation, Gilcrease pressed for a more inclusive model of colonial belonging when settler identity was becoming more and more a monopoly of white Canadians.

Anti-black sentiment erupted in 1849 when Canadian colonists in the Western District, in the southwestern portion of Canada West, learned that an agricultural settlement for formerly enslaved people was under way.[25] Conceived by William King, a Presbyterian clergyman from Ireland, the settlement sought to promote self-sufficiency and the religious well-being of those who had suffered "the debasing influence exerted by Slavery on their character." Naming the enterprise the Elgin Association after the governor-general of Canada, the Synod of the Presbyterian Church of Canada applied for a tract of government land in Raleigh Township.[26] When settlers in the area learned of the plan, they filed petitions and convened protest meetings to dissuade the government from selling land to the association.

The first large public protest took place on August 18, 1849, at the Royal Exchange Hotel in Chatham Township. Three hundred men gathered to devise

measures to stymie the project. The conference adopted an address, and the Council of the Western District submitted a petition requesting that Canada's governor-general stem black migration from across the border and restrict the suffrage of black residents of the province.[27] Other townships and individuals in the Western District similarly petitioned the government against the Elgin settlement and the extension of "certain civil and political rights" to black residents.[28]

White colonists opposed the settlement of former slaves in their midst on both racial and sexual grounds. The Chatham address denounced racial coexistence, for "nature has divided the same great family into distinct species for good and wise purpose and it is no less our interest, than it is our duty, to follow her dictates, and to obey her Laws." The Elgin Association allegedly violated the rules of nature by encouraging "the settlement in old and well established communities, of a race of people which is destined by nature to be distinct and separate from us." The repercussions of violating the law of nature were explained in sexual terms. The two races' spatial proximity would accompany "an evil"—that is, "amalgamation, its necessary and hideous attendant." The reference to *amalgamation* here was no surprise. As Adele Perry has pointed out, interracial sex had by this time become a proscribed behavior in British North America and was interpreted as a threat to the white settler colonial project of monopolizing access to land and resources.[29]

The Chatham address also contended that the coexistence of the two races in Canada was disrupting the racial order of the imperial space. The province's black presence contradicted a racial view of the imperial geography Canadian colonists considered unassailable even in view of the glorious imperial abolition. While valorizing "the Imperial Parliament of Great Britain" for "forever banish[ing] Slavery from the Empire" and letting "the slaves of the United States be free," the Chatham protesters opined that emancipation should not mean that the empire's black inhabitants should enjoy their newly acquired freedom in the same colonial space as whites. "The Parliament of Great Britain," the colonists asserted, "never intended that any portion of the inhabitants of her wide-spread realm should suffer wrong"—that is, "filling up our District with a race of people, upon whom we cannot look without a feeling of repulsion." In addition to demanding that former slaves "be separated from the whites," the settlers requested that "no encouragement shall hereafter be given to the emigration of the colored man from the United States, or anywhere else."[30]

The exclusion of formerly enslaved people from the Canadian landscape was further inscribed in colonial discourse through the representation of former slaves' experience of bondage and escape as markers of their incapacity to

become good colonial subjects. The Chatham address associated enslavement with a characteristic antithetical to the virtue fundamental to an agricultural settler colony: industry. The address enacted a racial dichotomy of the industrious British colonist and the lazy former slave, casting the latter as "the old, the maimed, the pauper, the lunatic" who had "been brought up in a state of bondage and servility" and thus needed "our charity to maintain." Past enslavement also had civic implications. The experience of bondage had rendered black migrants "totally ignorant . . . of their social and political duties" as responsible subjects in Canada. The act of escaping compounded their undesirability. That black migrants fled from slavery made their residence "much more revolting." The address warned that white settlers were receiving "the very worst specimens of that neglected race—the fugitives from slavery, and perhaps from justice." This characterization framed slave escape as a criminal act and cast fugitive slaves as questionable characters.[31]

Such vilifications buttressed the colonists' call to curtail black residents' enjoyment of social and political rights. To bring home to the government the white community's resolve to ensure white settler dominance in the civic as well as economic domain, the Western District Council petition recounted incidents of residents' de facto resistance to black participation in Canadian civic life. At one town meeting, "every individual white man" in attendance denied black participants a say when the blacks "insisted on their right to vote" for parish and town officers. The petitioners boasted that "no Sheriff in this Province would dare to summon Colored men to do Jury duty" and that white parents refused to educate their kids in public schools "in consequence of the Negroes insisting on their right of sending their children to such Schools."[32]

In response to the heightening anti-black sentiment, supporters of black settlement rejected black/white racial distinctions as the mechanism for defining who belonged in Canadian settler society, instead positing alternative conceptualizations of colonial belonging. These counterarguments filled the pages of two Toronto-based newspapers, the *Church* and the *Globe*. The former was a weekly newspaper with an unofficial affiliation to the Church of England, and the latter was a significant voice in the Canadian antislavery movement. The newspapers defended black residence in Canada, invoking a different system of classification from the black/white dichotomy through which white settlers reified the undesirability of self-emancipated people.

The alternative approach painted a picture of Canada as a colony that had been welcoming groups of "different nations" of "Englishmen . . . Irishmen [and] Scotchmen" and would do the same to its new addition—"Africans."[33] The designation *African* symbolized a more inclusive Canada, although the

term had come to denote a racial category that glossed over the ethnic and national differences among people of the African continent. It evoked the collective suitability for enslavement and marginalization of people of African descent and origin vis-à-vis European and American whites.[34] Also, using the designation *African* by no means meant that the paper abandoned altogether the black/white racial binary or the distinction between "the coloured race" and "their white brethren."[35]

Still, by using *Africans* in this specific moment, the *Globe* nullified the dichotomous symbolism of color employed by white settlers. The paper refused to employ color-coded racial classification as the primary system for defining who could set up "new homes" in Canada. Instead, it presented Canada as "a mixture of the different nations" of English, Scottish, and Irish immigrants to which a new nation—Africans—should be added.[36] The paper's recourse to this paradigm was not surprising, given the currency of this mode of differentiation among metropolitan and colonial actors during this era. The British imperial system indeed recognized national differences among its subjects and materialized those differences in political and social relationships beyond the textual sphere. According to historian John MacKenzie, the perceived distinctions between the British national groups created an intricate architecture for the operation of British colonial fronts.[37]

In urging that Canada accept Africans into the assembly of nations, the *Globe* put forth a classificatory system that combined the Eurocentric Enlightenment worldview of human progress and the Romantic model of differentiating humanity into nations.[38] Revealing the heterogeneity of ideas about difference in mid-nineteenth-century British colonial discourse, the paper both recognized the categories of the black and white races and embraced a Canadian version of the Enlightenment world that was "unilinear and hierarchical" but assumed the gap among different groups to be temporal and not constitutive of a fixed hierarchy.[39] The *Globe* envisioned that "Africans" in Canada would make moral and intellectual improvement "to an equality in every respect with the rest of the community" if placed in the right environment, the same view espoused by black writers in eighteenth-century North America and England who, according to historian James Sidbury, "re-placed Africa within the Enlightenment's grand narrative of human story."[40]

As ingenious as the *Globe* was, it designated only colonists of British origin as the constituents of the "mixture of different nations" that former slaves were to join. The *Church* followed with a similar but more inclusive configuration of nations. Included in the "mixture" was a new element: non-British Europeans who had settled in Canada. During the first half of the nineteenth

century, German immigration had grown from a stream of Mennonites to a sizable flow of settlers who dwelled in southwestern Canada alongside another non-British population, French Canadians.[41] Between 1844 and 1849, Canada received 10,164 Germans, 13,343 Scottish, 52,902 English, and 111,117 Irish.[42] In 1850, 60 percent of German immigrants in British North America resided in Waterloo County in southwestern Canada West, living on their own farms or in small settlements and creating communal culture through a German-language newspaper and German religious congregations.[43] The *Church* used these non-British elements in Canada to strengthen the case for the normality of former slaves' presence by characterizing the province's heterogeneity. By painting a picture of Canada as an assortment of diverse settlements of British as well as non-British "nations," the paper justified the introduction of a new settlement of "Africans": "We have already, in Canada, Scot, Irish, French, and German settlements. Why may we not have an African settlement?"[44]

Not surprisingly, the multinational categorization system proved problematic to an architect of the Western District petition because of its disruption of the black/white dichotomy and the racial hierarchy built on it. Edward Larwill, who drafted the petition and served as a member of the district council of Raleigh, framed European national groups into a single race in juxtaposition to the black race and defined colonial membership along that line. Like many other cases pointed out by scholars of race and immigration in the United States, Larwill's attempt at racial solidification presents an incipient example of Canadian construction of whiteness inclusive of different European nationalities.[45] While his earlier addresses specifically cast the white settler subject as Briton, calling Canada a colony set aside for "thousands of our countrymen of our own color [who] want a home, want sustenance," this definition changed by April 1850, three months after the pro-Elgin *Church* article appeared.[46] Still preferring those from "the Sister Isles, our own kith and kin," Larwill nonetheless integrated "our own countrymen and *all other Europeans*" into a single category that signified an "intelligent, industrious, moral, and religious" character. "Europe" was now the marker of the legitimate Canadian settler, who was in turn pitted against "the Negro from the United States, the lame, blind, deaf, dumb, paupers of every description." Underpinning this nascent differentiation between "Negro" and "European" was the language of nature, which gave a mantle of inevitability to racial segregation: "Nature has divided the human family into distinct classes for wise and beneficent purposes and such settlements would lead to a breach of her laws."[47]

Faced with the racially dichotomous hierarchy, black migrants espoused the Romantic classificatory system seen in the Toronto papers as an instrument for

colonial inclusion. As anti-black sentiment persisted into the 1850s, hardened by the Elgin Association's purchase of forty-three hundred acres of land, black activists invoked national difference to justify black newcomers' equal inclusion in the Canadian settler structure. In 1852, Ward referred to British national groups when he condemned the 1849 Western District Council petition as an insult to black "equal fellow subjects" and demanded that they be permitted to "buy and settle upon lands," as did "Irishmen, or Scotchmen."[48]

When Gilcrease wrote her speech, the narrative of enumerating European groups and self-emancipated people as distinct nations had circulated in Canada as a rhetorical tool to challenge the view of a white-only Canada. The perceived efficacy of such tactics might well have influenced Gilcrease's listing of formerly enslaved refugees and Eastern Europeans as different national groups. This formulation was also grafted onto the motif of "city of refuge." Against the backdrop of the celebratory image of England as a refuge for the nationalist revolutionaries, Gilcrease waged a politics of equation by calling formerly enslaved people a persecuted nation equally in need of protection and acceptance. By placing former slaves among the nations that deserved asylum in Britain, she highlighted Canada's anti-black racism as a deviation from the empire's benevolent stature.

Such a concept of nationality, however, differed from that embraced by the revolutionaries: black refugees' ultimate goal was to become equal members of a British colony, while the Europeans strove to create independent national sovereignties. On the one hand, Gilcrease used *nation* as the basic unit into which individuals were grouped and accepted into the Canadian colonial polity. On the other hand, her identification of the formerly enslaved as a nation derived meaning and effect from the powerful symbolism of the 1848 revolutions. Both concepts of nation gave meaning to her sense of injustice and articulated an alternative form of colonial belonging when black/white racial difference was gaining further ground in the definition of the proper member of the Canadian settler collective.

NOTES

1. *Provincial Freeman* (Chatham), April 26, 1856. It is important to note that in another part of her speech, Gilcrease elaborated on her definition of slave escape as migration for material improvement. She stressed the economic benefits of coming to Canada and in so doing constructed a black womanhood characterized by the responsibility to reproduce and nurture prosperous black settler families. See Ikuko Asaka, *Tropical Freedom: Climate, Settler Colonialism, and Black Exclusion in the Age of Emancipation* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2017), 133.

2. David Moon, *The Abolition of Serfdom in Russia, 1762–1907* (Harlow: Pearson Education, 2001), 23, 30, 177, 180.

3. On the revolutions of 1848, see Jonathan Sperber, *The European Revolutions, 1848–1851* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994); Dieter Dowe, Heinz-Gerhard Haupt, Dieter Langewiesche, and Jonathan Sperber, eds., *Europe in 1848: Revolution and Reform*, trans. David Higgins (New York: Berghahn, 2001). Dowe's one-thousand-page volume includes two chapters specifically on the revolutionary efforts by Hungarians and Poles. See Jiři Kořalka, "Revolutions in the Habsburg Monarchy," 145–69; Hans Henning Hahn, "The Polish Nation in the Revolution of 1846–49," 170–85.

4. R. J. M. Blackett, *Building an Antislavery Wall: Black Americans in the Atlantic Abolitionist Movement, 1830–1860* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1983), 10–11.

5. *Minutes of the State Convention of the Colored Citizens of Ohio, Convened at Columbus, Jan. 15th, 16th, 17th, and 18th, 1851*, quoted in Erica L. Ball, *To Live an Antislavery Life: Personal Politics and the Antebellum Black Middle Class* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2012), 120.

6. *Liberator*, November 14, 1851, quoted in W. Caleb McDaniel, *The Problem of Democracy in the Age of Slavery: Garrisonian Abolitionists and Transatlantic Reform* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2013), 197.

7. Ibid., 14.

8. *National Era* (Washington, D.C.), December 6, 1849.

9. Ibid., July 14, 1853.

10. *Frederick Douglass' Paper* (Rochester), January 8, 1852.

11. Ibid., December 25, 1851.

12. Ibid., January 15, 1852.

13. *Provincial Freeman* (Chatham), October 13, 1855.

14. An Aliens' Act, passed in 1848, prescribed the expulsion of individuals who were believed to pose danger to the political status quo of the nation. The act, however, lapsed in 1850 without deporting a single individual. See Bernard Porter, *The Refugee Question in Mid-Victorian Politics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979), 3; Andreas Fahrmeir, "British Exceptionalism in Perspective: Political Asylum in Continental Europe," in *Exiles from European Revolutions: Refugees in Mid-Victorian England*, ed. Sabine Freitag (New York: Berghahn, 2003), 32–40; Bernard Porter, "The Asylum of Nations: Britain and the Refugees of 1848," in *Exiles from European Revolutions*, ed. Freitag, 43–46.

15. Porter, *Refugee Question*, 4; Tibor Frank, "Lajos Kossuth and the Hungarian Exiles in London," in *Exiles from European Revolutions*, ed. Freitag, 125–26.

16. Krzysztof Marchlewicz, "Continuities and Innovations: Polish Emigration after 1848," in *Exiles from European Revolutions*, ed. Freitag, 103–20.

17. Frank, "Lajos Kossuth"; Porter, *Refugee Question*; Porter "Asylum of Nations."

18. *British Banner* (London), March 2, 1853.

19. *London Times*, February 28, 1853, quoted in Porter, "Asylum of Nations," 43; emphasis added.

20. Parliamentary Debates, 3rd ser., vol. 119, col. 675, April 5, 1852, quoted in Porter, *Refugee Question*, 1–2.

21. *British Banner* (London), October 30, 1850.

22. *Western Planet* (Chatham), November 1, 1855.

23. *British Banner* (London), June 2, 1852.

24. Porter, *Refugee Question*, 1.

25. When the colonies of Upper Canada and Lower Canada united to form the Province of Canada, the territory formerly comprising Upper Canada became known as Canada West.

26. *Ecclesiastical and Missionary Record for the Presbyterian Church of Canada* 5, no. 3 (January 1849), National Library of Canada. For general information on the Elgin Association, see Sharon A. Roger Hepburn, *Crossing the Border: A Free Black Community in Canada* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2007), 41–58; William H. Pease and Jane H. Pease, *Black Utopia: Negro Communal Experiments in America* (Madison: State Historical Society of Wisconsin, 1963), 84–108; Robin Winks, *The Blacks in Canada: A History*, 2nd ed. (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1997), 208–18; C. Peter Ripley, ed., *Black Abolitionist Papers* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1985), 2:254; Peggy Bristow, "'Whatever You Raise in the Ground You Can Sell It in Chatham': Black Women in Buxton and Chatham, 1850–1865," in *We're Rooted Here and They Can't Pull Us Up: Essays in African Canadian Women's History*, ed. Bristow (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1994), 69–142.

27. *Chatham Chronicle*, August 21, 1849; *Voice of the Fugitive* (Sandwich), September 9, 1852. See also *Chatham Chronicle*, October 16, 1849; *British Colonist* (Toronto), August 31, December 24, 1849.

28. "Journal of the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Canada, from the 14th Day of May to the 10th Day of August, Both Days Inclusive, and in the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Years of the Reign of Our Sovereign Lady Queen Victoria, Being the 3rd Session of the 3rd Provincial Parliament of Canada, 1850," 77, National Archives of Canada; see also xvii, 220.

29. *Chatham Chronicle*, August 21, 1849; Adele Perry, "Reproducing Colonialism in British Columbia, 1849–1871," in *Bodies in Contact: Rethinking Colonial Encounters in World History*, ed. Tony Ballantyne and Antoinette Burton (Durham: Duke University Press, 2005), 144–45. See also *British Colonist* (Toronto), August 31, 1849; Adele Perry, *On the Edge of Empire: Gender, Race, and the Making of British Columbia, 1849–1871* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2001), especially 109–13.

30. *Chatham Chronicle*, August 21, 1849. See also *British Colonist* (Toronto), August 31, 1849. This dichotomy of "whites" and "colored" presents an example of the much-examined construction of British colonists as "white" within nineteenth-century imperial contexts. On the formation of Britons as white, see Vron Ware, *Beyond the Pale: White Women, Racism, and History* (New York: Verso, 1992); Vron Ware and Les

Back, *Out of Whiteness: Color, Politics, and Culture* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2002); Catherine Hall, *Civilizing Subjects: Colony and Metropole in the English Imagination, 1830–1867* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2002); Robert Young, *Colonial Desire: Hybridity in Theory, Culture, and Race* (New York: Routledge, 1995); Simon Gikandi, *Maps of Englishness: Writing Identity in the Culture of Colonialism* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1996); John M. MacKenzie, *Propaganda and Empire: The Manipulation of British Public Opinion* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1984); Antoinette Burton, *Burdens of History: British Feminists, Indian Women and Imperial Culture, 1865–1915* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina, 1994); Antoinette Burton, "Introduction: On the Inadequacy and the Indispensability of the Nation," in *After the Imperial Turn: Thinking with and through the Nation*, ed. Burton (Durham: Duke University Press, 2003). Radhika Mohanram and Simon J. Potter propose the need to recognize that various factors shaped the ways and degrees that British imperial expansion influenced British "notions of the self." See Radhika Mohanram, *Imperial White: Race, Diaspora, and the British Empire* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2007), xix–xx; Simon J. Potter, "Empire, Cultures, and Identities in Nineteenth- and Twentieth-Century Britain," *History Compass* 5, no. 1 (2007): 51–71.

31. *Chatham Chronicle*, August 21, 1849; *British Colonist* (Toronto), August 31, 1849.

32. *Chatham Chronicle*, October 16, 1849.

33. *Globe* (Toronto), November 13, 1849.

34. On the development of the category of *African* and the construction of its meaning in British discourse, see James Sidbury, *Becoming African in America: Race and Nation in the Early Black Atlantic* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), 6–7; Winthrop Jordan, *White over Black: American Attitudes toward the Negro, 1550–1812* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1968); Philip D. Curtin, *The Image of Africa: British Ideas and Action, 1780–1850* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1964); Dorothy Hammond and Alta Jablow, *The Myth of Africa; or, The Africa That Never Was: Four Centuries of British Writing about Africa* (New York: Library of Social Science, 1977); James Walvin, *England, Slaves, and Freedom, 1776–1838* (Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 1986); Nicholas Hudson, "From 'Nation' to 'Race': The Origin of Racial Classification in Eighteenth-Century Thought," *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 29, no. 3 (1996): 247–64.

35. *Globe* (Toronto), November 13, 1849.

36. Ibid.

37. John M. MacKenzie, "Irish, Scottish, Welsh, and English Worlds? A Four-Nation Approach to the History of the British Empire," *History Compass* 6, no. 5 (2008): 1244–63. On Romantic articulations of British nationalisms and their relationships to the empire, see Juliet Shields, "From Family Roots to the Routes of Empire: National Tales and the Domestication of the Scottish Highlands," *ELH* 72, no. 4 (2005): 919–40; Ina Ferris, *The Romantic National Tale and the Question of Ireland* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002); Katie Trumpener, *Bardic Nationalism: The Romantic Novel and the British Empire* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997); Boyd C.

Shafer, *Faces of Nationalism: New Realities and Old Myths* (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1972), 141.

38. On Enlightenment and race, see Hudson, "From 'Nation' to 'Race'"; Roxann Wheeler, *The Complexion of Race: Categories of Difference in Eighteenth-Century British Culture* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2000), 177–90. On the ascendancy of the notion of fixed physical and intellectual traits in discussions of human difference and progress, see Hudson, "From 'Nation' to 'Race'"; Nancy Stepan, *The Idea of Race in Science: Great Britain, 1800–1960* (Hamden: Archon, 1982); Michael Banton, *The Idea of Race* (London: Tavistock, 1977). Laura Doyle has examined the connections between Romanticism and scientific racism in *Bordering on the Body: The Racial Matrix of Modern Fiction and Culture* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994), 35–80.

39. Young, *Colonial Desire*, 32.

40. *Globe* (Toronto), November 13, 1849; Sidbury, *Becoming African in America*, 7.

41. Jonathan Wagner, *A History of Migration from Germany to Canada, 1850–1939* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 2006), 7.

42. "Comparative Statement of the Number of Emigrants Arrived at the Port of Quebec since the Year 1829," December 29, 1849, MS 6910 RG 11-1-0-3, Provincial Archives of Ontario; A. B. Hawke to A. C. Buchanan, November 18, 1852 & March 10, 1853, Chief Emigrant Agent's Letterbooks, Letterbook of A. B. Hawke (1850–55), MS 6910, RG 11-1-0-4, Provincial Archives of Ontario.

43. Wagner, *History*, 7.

44. *Church* (Toronto), January 3, 1850.

45. See David R. Roediger, *The Wages of Whiteness: Race and the Making of the American Working Class* (New York: Verso, 1991); Michael Omi and Howard Winant, *Racial Formations in the United States from the 1960s to the 1990s* (New York: Routledge, 1994); Noel Ignatiev, *How the Irish Became White* (New York: Routledge, 1995).

46. *Chatham Chronicle*, February 5, 1850.

47. Ibid., April 30, 1850.

48. *Voice of the Fugitive* (Sandwich), October 21, 1852.

PART 2

Law and Legal Status

This page intentionally left blank

"To Break Our Chains and Form a Free People"

Race, Nation, and Haiti's Imperial Constitution of 1805

PHILIP KAISARY

On May 20, 1805, Jean-Jacques Dessalines, a former slave who had become the hero of Haitian independence and Haiti's first head of state, promulgated the Imperial Constitution of Haiti.[1] It was the first constitution of independent Haiti and only the second modern constitution adopted in the Americas outside the United States.[2] Codifying in law a free and sovereign state, the Empire of Haiti, the 1805 constitution is testament to the "creative destruction" of the long revolution of 1791–1804 that had preceded it.[3] Affirming both the abolition of slavery and the existence of the Haitian nation, the constitution reiterated the fundamental claims of Haiti's January 1804 Declaration of Independence, which had sent tremors across the Atlantic world.[4] However, despite the constitution's defiant anticolonialism and its affirmation of the abolition of slavery in the newly founded nation, it also enables a critique of the postcolonial Haitian state and its failure, until the 1820s, to transcend the socioeconomic complex of the plantation system. On the cusp of the revolution, the efficient brutality of that system was producing roughly half of the world's supplies of sugar and coffee, thereby generating prodigious wealth for France.[5] The system also fueled and satisfied a voracious European appetite for tropical luxury goods—at the cost of vast human suffering, torture, immiseration, and death. Indeed, the harshness of conditions under slavery on Saint-Domingue was such that the life expectancy for newly imported African slaves was no more than seven to ten years, while the colony's natural annual population growth rate was −5 percent.[6] The 1805 constitution, with its affirmation of national independence and its rhetoric of vengeance and liberation, must thus fundamentally be understood as an attempt to exorcize forever the horrors of the Atlantic slave system by ushering in a new state of being inasmuch as it created a new state that was to be forever free of the scourges of colonial domination and slavery.

However, despite the fact that, as Anthony Bogues has noted, the 1805 constitution was "the most inclusive statement about general human equality of the period," it failed to codify in law the core of the Haitian Revolution's radically democratic impulse.[7] The document—revolutionary and innovative but deeply flawed—was the product of a complex confluence of factors, primarily a principled ideology of liberty and self-determination, the context of a slaveholding and imperialist Atlantic world, and an acquiescence to the plantation-based mode of production. Dessalines and his contemporaries saw the plantation system as the only route to economic recovery following the ravages of war and consequently as the only means by which independence and liberty could be defended against foreign colonial and imperial powers. Their calculation quite reasonably concluded that protecting Haiti's political independence and freedom required a militarized state, the expense of which could only be met by the plantation economy. As a result, Haiti's first independence-era constitution contains a striking number of inconsistencies and contradictions. For example, the constitution proclaims freedom and liberty but also concentrates unchecked power in Dessalines's own hands. Like Toussaint Louverture's 1801 Constitution of Saint-Domingue, Dessalines's constitution, as Robert Fatton Jr. has written, "ratified the providential authoritarianism of a single all-powerful individual" while conflating revolutionary, liberal, and reactionary thinking in multiple ways.[8]

Dessalines's 1805 constitution, primarily authored by Dessalines's secretary of state, Juste Chanlatte, harnessed the concepts of race and nation to the project of constructing a post-French-colonial state premised on the human right to freedom from enslavement. This essay provides a synthetic overview of the recent scholarly attention to the constitution while situating it within the microcontext of the trajectory of the revolution as well as the macrocontext of the persistence of slavery in the Atlantic world well into the nineteenth century. This contextual analysis reveals the precarious situation of Haitian nationhood and independence and its complex (and at times contradictory) ideological thrust. The essay therefore considers Haiti's 1805 constitution as a document that is significant beyond the province of law and that must be considered in relation to Haiti's function as a symbol of hope for black freedom and equality throughout the Atlantic world. Reading the 1805 constitution as a literary-political text, the essay addresses the manner in which the constitution's authors sought to construct a black diasporic "family romance" of Haitian nationhood. This romance of nationhood should be understood as a strategy for the construction of a civic community that evoked African political thought, in which the opposite of enslavement was often not individual freedom but

political belonging. However, the "family romance" that the 1805 constitution constructed is indicative of the document's complex intertextual heritage, which includes unmistakable influences from the Thermidorian French Constitution of 1795.[9] At the heart of this project of imagining and building a new nation-state and a sociopolitical community resides a faith in the capacity of law to perform an act of de-reification, or, in Colin Dayan's phrasing, "an epistemological conversion."[10] Dessalines's constitution was to effect nothing less than the redemption of human beings previously rejected as "outcast children" (to quote from the preamble of the 1805 text) and identified as mere "chattels," transforming them into engaged citizens of a national family under the "father" and liberator, Dessalines. Dessalines's constitution attempted to perform the inverse of what Dayan has identified as the ever-present malignant potential of law's conversional logic: its capacity to categorize individuals, communities, or entire species as dispensable, eminently suited for reification, or deserving of destruction or incarceration.[11] In the context of slaveholding societies, this capacity could be observed, of course, in the classification of humans as "things, beasts or mongrels."[12] Finally, the 1805 constitution casts light on the limits of Haiti's revolutionary constitutionalism and the insufficiency of the categories of "race" and "nation" alone as conceptual political tools with which to agitate for true liberation.

The announcement of the 1805 constitution was one of the most remarkable moments in the history of a revolution that some critics have argued demonstrates the fullest articulation of a "radical Enlightenment," offering the promise that a "project of universal freedom" might yet be "redeemed and reconstituted."[13] The Haitian Revolution broke out in the French colony of Saint-Domingue toward the end of August 1791, when black slaves rose up and attacked plantations in the colony's richest sugar-growing district in the northern plains. As legend has it, the catalyst for the initial uprising was, to paraphrase Dayan, a weird and theatrical set piece that has long appealed to the gothic imagination and those seeking to denigrate the revolution.[14] On the night of August 14, 1791, a stormy night filled with thunder and lightning, a revolutionary pact was sworn at a vodou ceremony led by an *oungan* (vodou priest), Dutty Boukman, at Bois Caïman near the town of Le Cap. While numerous foreign accounts of the Bois Caïman ceremony have painted a gory and chaotic scene of blood drinking and savagery, the ceremony was in fact the result of months of meticulous planning. Whatever was said and done at the ceremony—words and deeds that have left no archival traces—the participants clearly emerged with a detailed and specific plan for revolt: eight days later, plantations across the colony's northern

territory were in flames. In a stunning organizational feat, a band of one to two thousand rebel slaves launched synchronized attacks on designated plantations across the northern plains.[15] The insurgency rapidly gained momentum. By November 1791, the rebel ranks had swollen to some eighty thousand, and by the spring of 1792, the uprising had escalated into a complex fight over the fate of Saint-Domingue involving Britain, France, and Spain. But for the formerly enslaved, the revolution was not yet a struggle for independence. Indeed, a full decade after the uprisings of August 1791, the revolutionaries, under the leadership of Toussaint Louverture, did not regard decolonization and the abolition of slavery as depending on state sovereignty.[16] Thus, Toussaint Louverture's 1801 Constitution for Saint-Domingue, which was promulgated in July 1801 and which named Louverture as governor of the colony for life, prohibited slavery but stopped short of declaring independence.[17] Though Saint-Domingue was by this stage functioning autonomously, Louverture apparently had doubts about the feasibility of complete independence and instead proposed an intermediary state structure of shared sovereignty.[18] Nevertheless, Napoleon regarded Louverture's Constitution for Saint-Domingue as an unacceptable affront and a dangerous step toward independence and in October 1801 ordered the dispatch of the largest colonial expeditionary force that France had yet assembled to reimpose French control over the colony and to reinstate slavery. Thus, only in 1802, following Louverture's demise, did the revolution become a war for independence. During this final stage of the revolution, Dessalines, who had been one of Louverture's senior officers, formed a new rebel army, the Armée Indigène, and on May 18, 1803, he created the Haitian flag by tearing the white from the French tricolor. Finally, on November 17, 1803, Dessalines led the rebels to a decisive victory at the Battle of Vertières, thus securing the path to independence.[19] Dessalines formally declared independence on January 1, 1804, pronouncing independence the fundamental guarantor of liberty: "We must, with one last act of national authority, forever ensure liberty's reign in the country of our birth; we must take any hope of re-enslaving us away from the inhuman government that for so long kept us in the most humiliating stagnation. In the end we must live independent or die."[20]

Thus, unlike anywhere else in the Atlantic world, in Haiti the abolition of slavery was the result of an armed liberation struggle waged by former slaves that became the mainspring of a drive for independence. As Julia Gaffield has noted, the inextricable link between the politics of nationalism and independence and the politics of slavery left an indelible mark on the course of Haitian state building for years to come, shaping the policies of each of Haiti's first three heads of state—Dessalines, Alexandre Pétion, and Henry Christophe.[21]

Dessalines's 1805 constitution must thus be understood as one of the first and most crucial pieces in a new project of postcolonial state building amid the ashes of an old order. The 1805 constitution sought nothing less than to justify Haiti's existence in racial and national terms, Dessalines's rule, and the politics of the antislavery and anticolonial movements. The project of Haitian nationhood was thus premised on, as Nick Nesbitt has put it, the emphatic "destruction of a normative world-system . . . that legitimized the enslavement, debasement, and torture of millions of Africans in New World slavery," even while the founders of Haitian independence reimplemented the plantation mode of production, thereby determining the limits of the Haitian state.[22]

Within this complex and radical struggle, the politics of constitutionalism, together with military might, were from the outset identified by the revolutionaries as a tool for achieving the desired social and political transformation. Though the 1805 document was independent Haiti's first constitution, it was neither the first nor the last constitution penned by Haiti's ex-slave revolutionaries. When Saint-Domingue's enslaved people rebelled against their erstwhile masters in August 1791, they set in motion a chain of events that produced a proliferation of significant legal and political writings. Haiti's absence from discussion in a wide variety of fields—including human rights historiography, citizenship studies, and global constitutional history—cannot be explained by any paucity of suitable texts ripe for analysis and interpretation. Perhaps the 1790 declaration of Saint-Domingue's Colonial Assembly of Saint Marc, which was the first expression of the thought that the territory of Saint-Domingue required a constitution of its own, should be considered the first constitution of the Haitian Revolution.[23] Moreover, as early as 1792, former slave Georges Biassou, one of the revolution's key early leaders, attempted to write a constitution with the assistance of a local abolitionist priest, Abbé Guillaume Sylvestre-Delahaye of Dondon.[24] Further, Dessalines's 1805 constitution was one of six Haitian constitutional documents enacted between 1801 and 1816. In addition to Toussaint Louverture's 1801 constitution for Saint-Domingue and Dessalines's 1805 constitution, there were Pétion's republican constitution of 1806 and its 1816 revision as well as Christophe's presidential constitution of 1807 and monarchical constitution of 1811. These constitutional documents enacted multiple forms of government—a colonial territory, an empire, a state, a republic, and a monarchy—each of which signified a different strategy of statecraft through which Haitian autonomy and economic prosperity were to be secured. Thus, from the earliest days of the revolution, the rebels understood the significance of constitutional authority and of construing legal grounds for their struggle against slavery and colonialism. For the Haitian revolutionaries, constitutional

language appears to have had an almost mystical power to overcome, obliterate, or alter socially produced realities. The legally inscribed word could erase racial distinctions, reset time, restore selfhood and humanity. Indeed, the centrality of constitutionalism to the Haitian Revolution has led Sibylle Fischer to argue that "no documents dating back to the early days of independence in Haiti speak more eloquently to the extraordinary nature of the events that had just come to a conclusion than the early constitutions."[25]

Further, the 1805 constitution speaks eloquently to the extraordinary situation in which the new state of Haiti found itself. The document's authors had no option other than to reconcile Haitian independence and antislavery with the fact that the Atlantic world system into which the new nation of Haiti had been born remained dominated by colonial powers, dependent on slave labor, and sustained by ideologies of racial hierarchy. Within this context, Haitian independence was thus both a beacon of inspiration for enslaved peoples throughout the black diaspora and a threatening example of the fragility of the Atlantic economy and its rising consumer culture.[26] The 1805 constitution recognized and responded to both these perceptions. Its nationalist, anticolonial, and antislavery core implicitly appealed to a politics of transnational racial solidarity. Hence, the constitution's final sentence reveals that the authors were cognizant of the document's significance to an international community: "We recommend [the values of the constitution] to our descendants and recommend it to the friends of liberty, to those who love mankind *in every country* as remarkable proof of divine goodness, whose immortal decrees have given us the opportunity to break our chains and form a free people, civilized and independent."[27] The constitution reached an international audience, as the authors had intended. Within weeks of its announcement, the constitution had been translated, excerpted, and published in newspapers throughout the Atlantic world.[28] As such, the constitution proved an effective vehicle not only for the communication of Haiti's radical anticolonial and antislavery stance but also for the purposes of strategic diplomacy. In somewhat subdued language, the constitution sought to reassure the international community that the revolution would not be exported beyond Haiti's national borders. Article 36 read, "The emperor will never undertake any project with the idea of conquest or to disturb the peace and internal regime of foreign colonies."[29] Deborah Jenson has noted that the 1805 constitution was promulgated after Dessalines's failed invasion of Santo Domingo.[30] However, the invasion of Santo Domingo should not be understood as a contravention of Article 36. Given that Santo Domingo was under French rule at the time that Haiti became independent, it could legitimately be viewed as part of Haiti rather than a foreign territory. Alternatively,

Dessalines may have regarded the invasion of Santo Domingo as prudent strategy of Haitian self-defense, which would also have been compatible with the principle of Article 36. Further reassurance to the international community was offered in Article 6 (which declared property rights to be sacred) and Article 25 of the constitution's "General Measures," which made clear that Haiti would be a willing and obedient trade partner, guaranteeing the safety of "neutral and friendly nations that establish commercial relations." In this manner, the authors of the 1805 constitution produced a document that played to Haiti's reputation as a beacon of black hope by underscoring Haiti's status as a land in which the brutalities of slavery and colonial rule had been defeated and expelled, as well as one that offered the international community sufficient reassurance that mutually beneficial diplomatic and economic relations could be established.

The 1805 constitution boldly staked Haiti's claim to a place in the Atlantic world's community of nations. But the means by which the constitution sought to establish a national "family" and the means by which it sought to negotiate the relationship between the drafters of the constitution and the nation's constituents were no less daring. A deep awareness of the elitist composition of the constitutional committee and the conditionality of the power vested in its members by the revolutionary masses is apparent from the unwieldy first sentence of the constitution's preamble:

> We, Henri Christophe, Clervaux, Vernet, Gabart, Pétion, Capoix, Magny, Cangé, Daut, Magloire Ambroise, Yayou, Jean-Louis François, Gérinm Moreau, Férou, Bazelais, Martial Besse;
>
> As individuals and in the name of the Haitian people who have legally constituted us the faithful voices and interpreters of their will;
>
> In the presence of the Supreme Being before whom all mortals are equal, and who has spread so many different creatures over the surface of the globe only in order to demonstrate his glory and power by the diversity of his works;
>
> Before all of nature, we who have been for so long and so unfairly considered to be its unworthy children, declare that the terms of this constitution are the free, voluntary, and unchanging expression of our hearts and of our constituents' general will.

As Anne Gulick has noted in her incisive analysis, this opening pays homage to the stylistic rhetoric of the preamble to the 1787 U.S. Constitution, but here "'We the People' becomes 'We the constitutional committee *plus* the people.'"[31] Thus, while the U.S. Constitution elides the gap between the Founding Fathers and the people, the 1805 Haitian constitution renders the gap explicit but ambiguous, establishing both solidarity and distance. However, as Gulick also notes,

the ambiguity surrounding the 1805 constitution's opening is deeper than the straightforward recognition of a separation between masses and elites. This opening *We* ambiguously refers to both the constitutional committee and the people of Haiti as "the victims of nature's past neglect; the possessors of expressive hearts; companions to those who hold the 'general will'; and finally, the group with the capacity to make direct contact with the state's executive power, who awaits the completion of this foundational national text."[32] Thus destabilizing unproblematic senses of the nation, democratic representation, and political agency, the preamble also implicitly posits the notion of a national family and of transnational families. The invocation of "the Supreme Being before whom all mortals are equal and who has spread so many different creatures over the surface of the globe" called forth not only a concept of a universal, transracial family of humankind but also a larger and even more diverse family of human and nonhuman living beings, all mortal and all equal. It is an astonishingly far-reaching proposition that recalls William Blake's statement of radical equality in *The Marriage of Heaven and Hell*, perhaps Blake's most inspired and revolutionary poetic work: "For everything that lives is holy."[33] Moreover, in addition to being evocative of Blake, the preamble enables us to identify the voice of the constitution's main author—Dessalines's Paris-educated secretary of state, Juste Chanlatte. The sentiment of multiracial and transspecies equality stunningly communicated in the preamble foreshadows Chanlatte's return to this theme in his 1811 prose work, *Cri de la Nature*, where Chanlatte wrote of "the common father of all men [who] wished to signal the magnificence of his works through the diverse shades of animals belonging to the same race [*les diverses teintes des animaux de la même race*]."[34] Thus, within Chanlatte's schema of radical racial egalitarianism that aspired to render phenotypic diversity an irrelevance, the project of Haitian state formation was supported by natural, divine, or supernatural justice, and the divine existed in all Haitians, as it did in all living creatures. In addition, the preamble also articulated the notion that Haitians, newly independent, constituted a family "who have been for so long and so unfairly considered to be . . . unworthy children" and that Dessalines was their avenger and liberator.

Following the preamble, the constitution featured a "Preliminary Declaration" that contained the first fourteen articles. The first article asserted that "the people living on the island formerly called Saint-Domingue agree to form a free and sovereign state, independent of all the other powers of the universe, under the name of the Haitian Empire." Through the act of legal naming, this first article made explicit the Haitian people's powers of self-determination. However, it also established the 1805 constitution as an imperial constitution making the

state of Haiti the center of an empire. Deborah Jenson has interpreted this imperial self-fashioning as evidence that Haiti's new government felt an essential need "to be imposing abroad" and to rescript "the forms of empire" such that Haiti would become an "antiempire" rhetorically capable of competing with French and European power.[35] Constitutional form and legal language thus here became the carriers of a state-level anticolonial poetics.

Having pronounced the existence of the Haitian nation and empire, the constitution's second article affirmed the abolition of slavery—it noted simply and expansively, "Slavery is abolished forever." And reading Article 2's abolition of slavery in conjunction with Article 6, which declares property rights to be sacred, the 1805 constitution logically asserted that property rights could not be held in human beings.[36] Having established the nation and reaffirmed the fact of emancipation, the constitution then returned to the theme of the family and of the political-familial relationships that bound together all Haitians. According to Article 3, "Brotherhood unites Haiti's citizens"; Article 9 stated, "No one is worthy of being a Haitian if he is not a good father, a good husband, and, above all, a good soldier"; and Article 10 prohibited parents from disinheriting their children. Such specific declarations and expectations centered on family have led Anna Mae Duane to note that the 1805 constitution "is remarkable for its nearly poetic investment in metaphors of family, and in particular in representations of just relations between parents and children."[37] However, in its imagining and positing of inextricable links among nation, citizenship, and family, the constitution valorized a militarized and masculine form of citizenship.[38] Of course, the French Revolution did no better on this score—with the French Constitution of 1795 standing as a particularly appropriate comparison—and that Dessalines's constitution aimed to uplift all Haitians into a new and engaged state of being. Nevertheless, the constitution's gender politics has led Mimi Sheller to lament the undermining of the revolution's radically democratic underpinnings, while Doris Garraway has noted how in expelling white males from Haiti but naturalizing white women, the 1805 constitution "secured the libidinal spoils of 'black' racial supremacy."[39] Hence, though the situation of both black men and women in Haiti improved after 1804, especially in terms of living conditions, freedom of movement, and sexual exploitation, women were not enfranchised, were barred from military service, and were instead conscripted into forced wage labor on state-owned plantations.[40]

The Haitian revolutionaries' decision to define Haitian nationhood and political belonging in familial terms was a reformulation of long-standing modes of perceiving the nation and understanding the nature of revolution. Lynn Hunt has argued that most eighteenth-century Europeans "thought of their nations

as families writ large."[41] This conception of the nation took hold in colonial Saint-Domingue and consequently in independent Haiti. In her study of the literary impact of the Haitian Revolution in the Atlantic world between 1789 and 1865, Marlene Daut has explored literary responses that evoked a slave rebellion with Oedipal significations in which the father-master was overthrown.[42] Finding evidence that narratives of "family romance" were also constructed by French colonial government officials in Saint-Domingue—with France as the motherland and the slaves as "her colonized, rebellious, and ungrateful children"—Daut has argued that "the myriad metaphors of family life" offered Saint-Domingue's colonists a language with which to infantilize the formerly enslaved while providing the "'rebellious 'children' with a grammar of violated rights with which to challenge the authority of their self-stated colonial parents."[43]

Hence, following John Patrick Walsh, Daut finds that in his memoir, Toussaint Louverture used the familial metaphor of the nation and wrote of the French general Leclerc as his brother and implicitly of Napoleon as his father.[44] Hence, in constructing the new Haiti as a "family writ large," with Dessalines as the emperor-father, the authors of the 1805 constitution redeployed a long-established trope of the nation as a familial community that also served as a rejection of "the domineering parental love that had been likened to despotic colonialism."[45] However, the key to the establishment of a political-familial community in the new Haiti was the negotiation of the racial question.

The race politics of Dessalines's 1805 constitution—and in particular Article 14—has become a subject of such fascination that Gaffield has recently speculated that "the constitution might be the most cited document in Haitian history."[46] Articulating an ideological, nonessentialist conception of race, Article 14 declares, "Because all distinctions of color among children of the same family must necessarily stop, Haitians will henceforth only be known generically as Blacks." Effecting an act of renewal and transformation through legal language and leading to a new subjectivity, this article performed the constitution's boldest act of "epistemological conversion," legitimizing the black race by codifying in law a verbal form of the blackening that had been "so feared by both colonists and the mulatto elite."[47] As such, this article took aim at what Dayan has called "the most problematic division in the new Haiti": that between the "anciens libres" and the "nouveaux libres." The majority of the former were the mulattoes and their children who now stood to lose the most in the aftermath of emancipation, while the latter were the newly freed, the majority of whom were black.[48] Dessalines's constitution thus advanced a race politics that was notably absent from Toussaint's race-neutral 1801 constitution. As Angela

Naimou has noted, the only mention of race in the 1801 text occurs in Article 4, which stipulated that men of all races were eligible for all forms of employment, whereas "Dessalines's 1805 Constitution makes blackness *the* political category of citizenship."[49] Recentering all normative categories to the black man, Dessalines sought to defuse the toxic inheritance of racial divisions in the new Haiti by sweeping away the system of racial classification that had existed in Saint-Domingue. This classification system had been painstakingly and exhaustively tabulated by colonial jurist and historian Moreau de Saint-Méry, who in 1797 had composed an "arithmetic and narrative typology of 'nuances of the skin' along a continuum between white and black."[50] Over nearly twenty pages, Saint-Méry classified the population of Saint-Domingue into 128 categories of varying racial mixture and color. Now, however, the entire Haitian national family was declared black, regardless of skin color, including some Poles and Germans who had defected from the French army and who had fought alongside the rebel former slaves. In addition, this radical destabilization of race was furthered by Article 13, which explicitly stipulated that white women who had been naturalized as Haitian citizens as well as their "existing or future" children would legally be considered black.

Critical readings of Article 14 have explored its political and philosophical basis and implications from a number of perspectives. For Fischer, the article cannot be read as a straightforward "juridical fiction"; rather, it must be recognized as an example of "expressive lawmaking," which, Fischer alleges, "performs one of the most troubling paradoxes of modern universalist politics—the paradox that the universal is typically derived through a generalization of one of the particulars." Hence, Fischer points out that recategorizing all Haitians as black, regardless of skin color, is akin to "calling all people, regardless of their sex, women." Both strategies assert "egalitarian and universalist intuitions" by adopting the previously subordinated category as a signifier of the universal.[51]

Jean Casimir's theorization of Article 14 stresses synthesis but is highly comparable to Fischer's identification of the universalization of a particular. Blackness in the new Haiti, according to Casimir, "encompassed the various ethnic groups that had been involved in the struggle against the Western vision of mankind. Victory in adversity gave birth to this new character, which was a synthesis not only of Ibos, Aradas, and Hausas but also of French, Germans, and Poles."[52] Garraway, conversely, reads Article 14 and its assertion that all Haitians are black not as a generalization or universalization of the previously subordinated category or as a synthesis of multiple races into the category of black but as "a negative universalism." Arguing that the constitution primarily excludes a particularity (whiteness) rather than universalizes "blackness" in

its construction of a universal politics, Garraway asserts that Article 14 serves "as an ironic parody of any attempt to define human beings in terms of racial particularity at all." Instead, she asserts, it invalidates "the biologist taxonomies through which colonial elites had discriminated against people of color in Saint-Domingue."[53] A politics of racial exclusion also modified the constitution's declaration of sacrosanct property rights: seeking to defend the nation from neocolonial encroachment, Article 12 declared, "No white man, regardless of his nationality, may set foot in this territory as a master or landowner, nor will he ever be able to acquire any property." This provision, as Jeremy Popkin has noted, became "one of the defining principles of Haitian independence [and] its cancellation during the occupation of the country by the United States in the early twentieth century still rankles with many Haitians."[54] Finally, Laurent Dubois has noted that Article 14 made "blackness not so much an issue of color as of allegiance to the project of freedom and independence."[55] However, none of these nimble and insightful explorations of Article 14 has speculated on the reasons for this shift in the racial-political rhetoric of the Haitian state from indigeneity to blackness. As David Geggus has noted, "Appeals to 'blackness' seem to have been rare during the Revolution" itself. Such appeals were, after all, potentially divisive, whereas recourse to "Amerindian symbolism provided a sort of neutral, non-European reference point."[56] Hence, in the war of independence against the French, Dessalines's army was named the Armée Indigène (Indigenous Army), and in naming the nation in 1803, the revolutionaries recuperated the pre-Columbian Taíno Arawak name for the island, Ayiti (Land of High Mountains). An additional explanation for this shift in racial rhetoric might be found in the nomenclature pertaining to race in Haitian Creole, which may or may not have impacted the drafting of the constitution in French. In Haitian Creole, *nèg* means "person," regardless of skin color, while *blan* means "foreigner." Thus a non-black Haitian would be called *nèg*, whereas a black non-Haitian would be called *blan*. Thus, in labeling all Haitians as *noirs* (blacks), the drafters of the 1805 constitution may simply have been transposing a concept already established in Haitian Creole into the country's founding legal text, which was written in French. Gaffield has recently speculated on this point, asking whether, "given that Jean-Jacques Dessalines did not speak French fluently, did the 1805 Constitution intend to label all Haitian citizens as 'black' or as 'people'? Or, did the 1805 Constitution encourage the evolution of the term *noir* or *nèg* to signify the universality of all citizens?"[57] However, given Chanlatte's involvement in drafting the constitution, there can be no doubt that the constitutional committee was cognizant of the radicalism of their concept of ideological blackness. This articulation of a racialized, nonwhite Haitian na-

tional identity recurred in Chanlatte's later literary writings.[58] Moreover, the fact that after Dessalines's death in 1806 no future Haitian constitution would include or recuperate Article 14 in any modified form appears to provide evidence of the article's idiosyncrasy. By constructing blackness as a signifier of Haitian citizenship and of the Haitian people's refusal of colonial racism and domination, Article 14 performed a counterintuitive utopian act that suggested that nothing was impossible: to echo both Karl Marx and Arthur Rimbaud, the revolution could both transform the world and change life.

Johnhenry Gonzalez has noted that "every Haitian constitution began by affirming that there were not and could not ever be any slaves in Haiti," yet until the death of Christophe and the turbulent collapse of his northern kingdom in 1820, Haiti's leaders sought to "square the rhetoric and politics of antislavery with draconian systems of forced labor."[59] Dessalines's 1805 constitution, like Toussaint's, Christophe's, and Pétion's constitutions, reflected a lack of recognition among the revolutionary elite that as soon as the French had been defeated, the days of the hated plantation system were numbered. The revolutionary masses' rejection of slavery was also a rejection of life subordinated to the strictures and demands of the plantation. Moreover, the revolution constituted an inchoate but profound rejection of all modes of production that depended on domination and terror, regardless of any compensatory payments in kind and wages. It was a profound and prolonged modern "workers' revolt" on a grand scale.[60] The political mantras of "race" and "nation," revolutionary though they were, would thus only go so far in satisfying the ex-slaves' demand for a radical form of both political and economic freedom.[61] Although those who drafted Dessalines's 1805 constitution either ignored or failed to recognize this impulse to a radical freedom, the constitution nevertheless represented multiple achievements and should be honored for its aspirations. Above all else, it shattered racialized thinking by positing a remarkable transracial and transspecies egalitarianism. Moreover, Dessalines's constitution also made a range of claims that transcended the normative constraints prevailing in societies that claimed democratic credentials: it established the right of equality before the law (Article 4), the right to be free from retroactive laws (Article 5), divorce (General Measures, Article 15), and public schools (General Measures, Article 19), and it set out to safeguard "the sacred rights of man and the duties of the citizen" (final paragraph). It also dispensed with the moralizing tone of Toussaint's 1801 constitution. It abolished Catholicism as the state religion while providing for freedom of worship (Articles 50 and 51), even though, ironically given his posthumous incarnation as a *lwa* (vodou god), "Dessalines was as hostile to the popular cult of *vodou* as Toussaint had been."[62] Thus, to regard

Dessalines's 1805 constitution as merely a flawed document of state formation is to see merely the tip of the iceberg. Though deeply autocratic and contradictory, Dessalines's constitution represented a highly imaginative attempt to exorcise the horrors of the Atlantic slave system and to deliver a revived people into a new and decolonized state of being. Even though it concentrated near unlimited power in Dessalines personally, and despite its glorification of traditional masculine values, the 1805 constitution articulated a radical anticolonial politics that explicitly renounced racial categorization and inspired enslaved peoples throughout the Americas. Dessalines's constitution thus offers a glimpse of the agonizing difficulties of building a future in which a new state of being of universal human flourishing might become a material reality.

NOTES

1. The complete text of the 1805 Imperial Constitution of Haiti is reproduced in Laurent Dubois, Julia Gaffield, and Michel Acacia, eds., *Documents Constitutionnels d'Haïti, 1790–1860* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2013), 63–69. For an English translation, see Laurent Dubois and John D. Garrigus, *Slave Revolution in the Caribbean, 1789–1804: A Brief History with Documents* (New York: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2006), 191–96.

2. The first non-U.S. constitution issued in the Americas was the 1801 Constitution of Saint-Domingue, promulgated by the great architect of the Haitian Revolution, Toussaint Louverture.

3. The notion that the Haitian Revolution should be interpreted as a process of "creative destruction" that did not end with the achievement of independence in 1804 is developed in Johnhenry Gonzalez, "The War on Sugar: Forced Labour, Commodity Production, and the Origins of the Haitian Peasantry, 1791–1843" (PhD diss., University of Chicago, 2012), 3.

4. For a complete translation of the text of the Haitian Declaration of Independence, see Julia Gaffield, ed., *The Haitian Declaration of Independence: Creation, Context, and Legacy* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2016), 239–47.

5. Jeremy A. Popkin, *A Concise History of the Haitian Revolution* (Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2012), 2.

6. Ibid., 16.

7. Anthony Bogues, "The Dual Haitian Revolution and the Making of Freedom in Modernity," in *Human Rights from a Third World Perspective: Critique, History, and International Law*, ed. José-Manuel Barreto (Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars, 2013), 224.

8. Robert Fatton Jr., "The Haitian Authoritarian 'Habitus' and the Contradictory Legacy of 1804," *Journal of Haitian Studies* 10, no. 1 (2004): 22; Roberto Gargarella, *Latin American Constitutionalism, 1810–2010: The Engine Room of the Constitution* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013), 24.

9. See Lauren Benton, *Law and Colonial Cultures: Legal Regimes in World History, 1400–1900* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 31–79.

10. Colin [Joan] Dayan, *Haiti, History, and the Gods* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995), 26.

11. For an elaboration of this theme in Dayan's work, see Chris Bongie, "Haiti, History, and the Law: Colin Dayan's Fables of Conversion," *Small Axe* 45 (2014): 162–77. Bongie's article predates Dayan's most recent work, which explores this theme. See Colin Dayan, *With Dogs at the Edge of Life* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2015).

12. Dayan, *Haiti, History, and the Gods*, 258.

13. Nick Nesbitt, *Universal Emancipation: The Haitian Revolution and the Radical Enlightenment* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2008); Susan Buck-Morss, *Hegel, Haiti, and Universal History* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2009), 74–75.

14. Dayan, *Haiti, History, and the Gods*, 29.

15. The military discipline and tactical sophistication of the ex-slave rebels would become a hallmark of the revolution and has drawn considerable comment and speculation. See Laurent Dubois, *Avengers of the New World: The Story of the Haitian Revolution* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2004), 184; C. L. R. James, *The Black Jacobins*, 2nd rev. ed. (New York: Vintage, 1963), 116–17; John Thornton, "African Soldiers in the Haitian Revolution," *Journal of Caribbean History* 25 (1993): 58–80.

16. Toussaint Louverture's project of antislavery and decolonization without national independence can be read as an incipient version of Aimé Césaire's and Léopold Senghor's twentieth-century attempts to secure self-determination without state sovereignty. See Gary Wilder, *Freedom Time: Negritude, Decolonization, and the Future of the World* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2015). See also John Patrick Walsh, *Free and French in the Caribbean: Toussaint Louverture, Aimé Césaire, and Narratives of Loyal Opposition* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2013).

17. Like Dessalines's constitution after it, Toussaint's constitution failed to dismantle the plantation system. See Philip Kaisary, "Hercules, the Hydra, and the 1801 Constitution of Toussaint Louverture," *Atlantic Studies* 12, no. 4 (2015): 393–411.

18. Walsh, *Free and French*, 78–79.

19. Dubois's *Avengers of the New World* has rapidly become the standard history of the Haitian Revolution. The best summary is Popkin's *Concise History*. However, James's classic account, *Black Jacobins*, remains invaluable.

20. Jean-Jacques Dessalines and Louis Boisrond-Tonnerre, "The Haitian Declaration of Independence," in Dubois and Garrigus, *Slave Revolution*, 188. Authorship of the Haitian Independence Declaration has traditionally been attributed to Dessalines's secretary, Boisrond-Tonnerre. However, Deborah Jenson has recently made the argument that Dessalines himself was "the crucial conceptual voice" of the declaration. See Deborah Jenson, *Beyond the Slave Narrative: Politics, Sex, and Manuscripts in the Haitian Revolution* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2011), 86–90.

21. Julia Gaffield, "'Liberté, Indépendance': Haitian Anti-Slavery and National Independence," in *A Global History of Anti-Slavery Politics in the Nineteenth Century*, ed. William Mulligan and Maurice Bric (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013), 17.

22. Nick Nesbitt, *Caribbean Critique: Antillean Critical Theory from Toussaint to Glissant* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2013), 161; Nick Nesbitt, "From Louverture to Lenin: Aimé Césaire and Anticolonial Marxism," *Small Axe* 48 (November 2015): 131.

23. Malick Ghachem has argued for the existence of surprising continuities between the 1790 Declaration of Saint Marc and the constitutions of Haiti's early independence period. See Malick W. Ghachem, *The Old Regime and the Haitian Revolution* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012).

24. Jane Landers, *Atlantic Creoles in the Age of Revolutions* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2010), 68.

25. Sibylle Fischer, *Modernity Disavowed: Haiti and the Cultures of Slavery in the Age of Revolution* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2004), 227. The only book-length study of Haitian constitutions is Claude Moïse's three-volume work, *Constitutions et Lutte de Pouvoir en Haïti* (Port-au-Prince: Les Presses de l'Université d'État d'Haïti, 1988–2009). Recent articles and book chapters addressing Haitian constitutions, from multiple disciplinary perspectives, include Bogues, "Dual Haitian Revolution," 208–36; Ada Ferrer, "Haiti, Free Soil, and Antislavery in the Revolutionary Atlantic," *American Historical Review* 117, no. 1 (February 2012): 40–66; Julia Gaffield, "Complexities of Imagining Haiti: A Study of National Constitutions, 1801–1807," *Journal of Social History* 41, no. 1 (Fall 2007): 81–103; Anne Gulick, "We Are Not the People: The 1805 Haitian Constitution's Challenge to Political Legibility in the Age of Revolution," *American Literature* 78, no. 4 (2006): 799–820; Kaisary, "Hercules," 393–411; Walsh, *Free and French*, 65–79.

26. For more on how Haiti rapidly became regarded as a site of iconic inspiration for blacks throughout the diaspora, see Michel-Rolph Trouillot, *Silencing the Past: Power and the Production of History* (Boston: Beacon, 1995); David Nicholls, *From Dessalines to Duvalier: Race, Colour, and National Independence in Haiti* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979).

27. Emphasis added. All quotations from the 1805 constitution are taken from the translation in Dubois and Garrigus, *Slave Revolution*.

28. Ada Ferrer has noted that the constitution was published widely in the United States, including in the *New York Gazette and General Advertiser*, July 15, 1805; *New York Commercial Advertiser*, July 15, 1805; *Aurora General Advertiser* (Philadelphia), July 17, 1805; *The Democrat* (Boston), July 20, 1805; *National Intelligencer* (Washington, D.C.), July 22, 1805 (*Freedom's Mirror: Cuba and Haiti in the Age of Revolution* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014], 207 n. 50).

29. The question of whether Dessalines proclaimed a policy of international noninterference while surreptitiously supporting the cause of antislavery abroad has drawn considerable comment. For three different perspectives on the question, see Ferrer, *Freedom's Mirror*, 206–13; Philippe Girard, "Did Dessalines Plan to Export the Haitian Revolution?," in *Haitian Declaration of Independence*, ed. Gaffield, 136–57; Jenson, *Beyond the Slave Narrative*, 161–94.

30. Jenson, *Beyond the Slave Narrative*, 165–66.

31. Gulick, "We Are Not the People," 803.

32. Ibid., 804.

33. William Blake, "The Marriage of Heaven and Hell," 1793, in *The Complete Poems*, ed. Alicia Ostriker (London: Penguin, 1977), 186.

34. Chanlatte quoted and translated in Chris Bongie, "The Cry of History: Juste Chanlatte and the Unsettling (Presence) of Race in Early Haitian Literature," *MLN* 130, no. 4 (2015): 820.

35. Jenson, *Beyond the Slave Narrative*, 105, 106.

36. Nesbitt has identified Toussaint Louverture's 1801 constitution as the first modern constitution to address this conflict between property rights and human rights. See Nick Nesbitt, ed., *Toussaint L'Ouverture: The Haitian Revolution* (London: Verso, 2008), 45–61.

37. Anna Mae Duane, *Suffering Childhood in Early America: Violence, Race, and the Making of the Child Victim* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2010), 138.

38. For Diana Paton and Pamela Scully, in this respect, the Haitian Revolution "showed its ideological links to the Enlightenment and to the French Revolution, which made the same connection between revolutionary citizenship and masculinity" ("Gender and Slave Emancipation in Comparative Perspective," in *Gender and Slave Emancipation in the Atlantic World*, ed. Scully and Paton [Durham: Duke University Press, 2005], 11).

39. Mimi Sheller, "Sword-Bearing Citizens," in *Citizenship from Below: Erotic Agency and Caribbean Freedom* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2012), 142–65, especially 142, 148; Doris Garaway, *The Libertine Colony: Creolization in the Early French Caribbean* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2005), 292.

40. For the lack of women's rights in the Atlantic world in the Age of Emancipations, see Scully and Paton, *Gender and Slave Emancipation*; Kathryn Kish Sklar and James Brewer Stewart, eds., *Women's Rights and Transatlantic Antislavery in the Era of Emancipation* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2007).

41. Lynn Hunt, *The Family Romance of the French Revolution* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992), xiv.

42. Marlene Daut, *Tropics of Haiti: Race and the Literary History of the Haitian Revolution in the Atlantic World, 1789–1865* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2015), 373–74.

43. Ibid., 374.

44. Ibid., 376–77. See also Walsh, *Free and French*.

45. Daut, *Tropics of Haiti*, 457–58.

46. Julia Gaffield, "Race and the Haitian Constitution of 1805," https://uniqueatpenn.wordpress.com/2015/12/21/race-and-the-haitian-constitution-of-1805/.

47. Dayan, *Haiti, History, and the Gods*, 25, 26.

48. Ibid., 24–25.

49. Angela Naimou, *Salvage Work: U.S. and Caribbean Literatures amid the Debris of Legal Personhood* (New York: Fordham University Press, 2015), 37.

50. Doris L. Garraway, "Race, Reproduction, and Family Romance in Moreau de Saint-Méry's *Description de la Partie Française de l'Isle Saint-Domingue*," *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 38, no. 2 (2005): 227.

51. Fischer, *Modernity Disavowed*, 233.

52. Jean Casimir, prologue to *The World of the Haitian Revolution*, ed. David Patrick Geggus and Norman Fiering (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2009), xv.

53. Doris L. Garraway, "'*Légitime Défense*': Universalism and Nationalism in the Discourse of the Haitian Revolution," in *Tree of Liberty: Cultural Legacies of the Haitian Revolution in the Atlantic World*, ed. Garraway (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2008), 82.

54. Popkin, *Concise History*, 138.

55. Laurent Dubois, *Haiti: The Aftershocks of History* (New York: Holt/Metropolitan, 2012), 43.

56. David Geggus, "The Naming of Haiti," *New West Indian Guide* 71, nos. 1–2 (1997): 46.

57. Gaffield, "Race and the Haitian Constitution."

58. Bongie, "Cry of History," 809.

59. Gonzalez, "War on Sugar," 47, 56.

60. Peter Linebaugh and Marcus Rediker, *The Many-Headed Hydra: Sailors, Slaves, Commoners, and the Hidden History of the Revolutionary Atlantic*, 2nd ed. (Boston: Beacon, 2013), 319.

61. The prescience of the vision of the former slaves of Saint-Domingue in this regard should be set in the context that it was only in the mid-nineteenth century, with the work of Karl Marx, that questions of freedom began to considered in relation to wage labor. See Bogues, "Dual Haitian Revolution," 233 n. 64.

62. Popkin, *Concise History*, 138.

Seaman and Citizen

Learning the Law of Citizenship, from Baltimore to Valparaiso

MARTHA S. JONES

He was born in 1806, just two years after the Haitian Revolution had extinguished slavery and replaced French colonial rule with an independent black republic. Growing up as he did in Baltimore, Maryland, George Hackett was a child of the Age of Revolutions. His birthright included claims wrought of Enlightenment ideals, including a condemnation of bondage and an entitlement to universal rights. Coming of age in the early decades of the nineteenth century, Hackett became a young man in the Age of Emancipations. From his home in a burgeoning port city, Hackett grew up alongside radical antislavery movements and abolition in the northern United States, Latin America, and later the British Caribbean. Hackett had been born free in the slave state of Maryland, and this fact, along with the questions about citizenship that attended it, linked him to former slaves and their descendants throughout the Americas. No longer bound as unfree laborers or held as property, who were black men and women to the body politic?

Hackett grew up in a community of black activists, many of whom answered these questions through the building of institutions: churches, political organizations, schools, and newspapers. Their associational life and the resources and leadership developed within them were said to be evidence of black Americans' depth of belonging. They set out their contributions to the nation as well. Labor and military service had earned black Americans their place. Birthright was their final claim. Born in the United States, Baltimore's black leaders argued that they were entitled to the privileges and immunities of citizens.

Were black Americans citizens of the United States in the first decades of the nineteenth century? Lawmakers debated this question in constitutional conventions, Congress, courthouses, and public culture. Black activists took up this question as well, and for them the stakes were high. As citizens, they could justly resist efforts to banish, exile, or otherwise remove them from the

United States through colonization schemes or black laws. Citizenship, it was asserted, ensured one's right to remain present within the territorial boundaries of the nation.

One important component of these debates was the emergence of African American legal consciousness. Scholars have generally explained black activism of the antebellum period through political and cultural thought, but recovering debates over citizenship illustrates that an emerging awareness, intellectual acumen, and critical practice related to law was also at work. Without formal training—through either law school or apprenticeship—black activists developed understandings of the law's text and interpretation as well as its precepts and rituals. Hackett was one of many black mariners who served on seaborne vessels in the first decades of the nineteenth century. Life aboard a frigate provided him and others with a brand of legal education. Hackett's voyages aboard the USS *Constitution* between 1830 and 1841 taught him about the practices of race and law in the ports of the Americas. In Havana, Rio de Janeiro, and Valparaiso, he learned how his status as a free black man in Baltimore differed from the statuses of his counterparts elsewhere. The *Constitution* was also a courthouse of sorts. Courts-martial and courts of inquiry, convened by the commodore for whom Hackett worked, became a primer on rules, procedures, and the ways in which law mitigated against the raw power exerted by sailors on deck. And even on deck, Hackett saw how black mariners might make claims and give evidence when wrongdoing was alleged. The *Constitution* was no law school, nor did it provide for the systematic reading of law that typified legal education before the Civil War. Still, Hackett returned to life in Baltimore with new insights, tools, and visions that proved invaluable in his quest for citizenship in the decades that followed.

Atlantic history as told through Hackett's journey reframes the history of race and rights in Baltimore, suggesting how lessons learned by black mariners could reverberate through a community and last long after seamen gave up their itinerant lifestyles. Historians have emphasized the degree to which sailors' communication networks were a key dimension of the Atlantic world's politics of revolution. This scene also fueled transformations in port cities, giving them a vantage point that was not narrowly framed by the sectional politics of antebellum America. Hackett provides one example of this potential, and his story provides a companion to the stories of many others—black migrants, travelers, fugitives, and seamen—who linked the political and legal aspirations of black Baltimoreans to a broader world. As Hackett and his community battled for legal recognition in the Age of Emancipations, they did so in knowing concert with former slaves and their descendants throughout the hemisphere.

George Hackett was raised by a father who was himself an activist. Charles Hackett was a church builder, school founder, and newspaper agent. When George married Mary Jane Gilliard in the fall of 1828, his father must have been pleased. Mary Jane's father, Nicholas, had long been Charles's fellow lay leader at Bethel African Methodist Episcopal Church. Ambition and leadership were passing to a new generation.[1] George was literate, signing his name with a studied flourish. He aimed to join Baltimore's tiny class of African American skilled workers and entrepreneurs, working as a waiter for a short time and then in 1831 beginning his own enterprise as a livery stable operator. Luck did not favor the venture. By 1837, his stable was washed out by a flood. Not only were his horses killed but the floodwaters revealed skeletal human remains, and Hackett was briefly suspected of trading in cadavers. Though the charges were dropped, he saw his business washed away, literally. The following year, his only son and namesake died, and Hackett must have wondered how to turn around his life and that of his young family.

Hackett then became one of the many free black men who joined the maritime workforce. According to historian Jeffrey Bolster, seafaring was among the three or four most common occupations among free black men in port cities from Maine to Maryland. Going to sea was a strategy by which aspiring families could elevate their status. Although the duties of black sailors were confined to domestic work, the wages were fair: black and white sailors were paid equally. Entrepreneurial seamen might trade at various ports of call to supplement their pay. Time away from home meant they strained to maintain family lives. But unlike their white counterparts, who were often transients seeking adventure, African American sailors sought to establish their respectability and leadership at home through service on the sea.[2]

Hackett's opportunity came in the spring of 1839. U.S. Navy commodore Alexander Claxton, a Baltimore native, was preparing to lead the Pacific Squadron aboard the flagship USS *Constitution*.[3] George soon found himself among the dozens of men preparing the ship for its voyage. He ensured that the commodore's accommodations were well stocked, carrying wine chosen especially for the voyage from Baltimore to Norfolk, Virginia, where the *Constitution* was being readied.[4] As steward, Hackett occupied a relatively elite station. Space on board was highly regulated, segregated by status and rank. Most sailors never saw the inside of the wardroom, where officers took their meals and socialized when off duty. Regular seamen lived belowdecks. Even fewer entered the commodore's quarters, which were reserved for a small staff and visiting dignitaries. His position excused Hackett from time spent in many of the ship's rougher spaces, and it gave him access to the commodore's deliberations and

consultations. He was a quiet presence when, for example, Claxton dictated his regular correspondence to the *Constitution*'s captain, Daniel Turner; naval officials in Washington; and family and friends. The steward was a body servant, tending to the commodore's clothes and grooming. Hackett was also a waiter, serving meals, pouring wine, and delivering tea, and a butler, attending to the laying out, washing, and pressing of uniforms and the shining of shoes.[5]

Black abolitionist James McCune Smith penned a humorous description of a ship's steward for *Frederick Douglass' Paper* in which he suggested the high esteem in which stewards might be held. On transatlantic crossings, Smith explained, while the captain "sailed the ship, the Steward hosted her." His duties demanded "no little talent and expertise" and "much headwork," ensuring that the ship was properly provisioned. Also, he was expected to step in when others were unable to perform, becoming parson, lifesaver, or escort for an unaccompanied woman or child.[6] The ship's administration reflected the exceptional status Hackett occupied. When Captain Turner provided naval officials with his monthly accounting of the personnel aboard the *Constitution*, he carefully noted that the commodore's staff was administratively distinct from the regular crew. That staff included five people: the commodore himself as well as his secretary, steward, coxswain, and cook.[7] Hackett's post was more isolated than most, but his station in the commodore's quarters ensured that he received an education in commerce, diplomacy, discipline, and law.

The frame of Hackett's life was redrawn as his work as a mariner gave him a new vantage point on freedom and citizenship. If the constitutions of the United States and of Maryland had framed the early decades of his life, Hackett's time spent with the navy resituated free African American citizenship in hemispheric terms. At each port of call—Veracruz, Mexico; Havana, Cuba; Rio de Janeiro, Brazil; and Valparaiso, Chile—Hackett encountered a distinct legal regime.[8] Each was a counterpoint to his home of Baltimore. A slow and not always deliberate process of manumission and abolition was under way in the Americas, with free people of color generating consternation and contests over their status. From his vantage point aboard the *Constitution*, Hackett absorbed new lessons about race and rights.

Hackett and other seamen posed a unique set of questions about citizenship. In 1803, congressional deliberations over seamen's protections had assumed that "free persons of color" were protected like all seamen citizens. In the 1820s, some observers asked whether a free black man could command an American merchant vessel when the law provided that only citizens could command such ships. Attorney general William Wirt opined that if free black men were not citizens of their state, they were disqualified from commanding such vessels. On the heels

of Wirt's ruling, southern states began to pass Negro Seamen Acts that required black sailors to remain confined aboard ship or in the local jail when in port. Courts approved. Still, free black sailors also could be deemed citizens. Most sailors carried seamen's protection certificates, U.S. government–issued documents that evidenced their citizenship, essential in foreign ports. During Hackett's tenure with the navy, he likely would have carried evidence of his legal status as a citizen to present to foreign authorities, despite holdings to the contrary at home.[9]

Hackett was prepared for what lay ahead. His education had begun in Baltimore itself, fueled by sailors' communication networks. Hackett's primers had been the African American and antislavery press. In the months before he left Baltimore, editors chronicled an unfolding story of slavery versus freedom in the Americas. Mexico was singled out for having abolished slavery, while opposition was expressed over the prospect of annexing Texas as a slaveholding territory.[10] In Cuba, African American traveler George Davison was detained in Havana on a charge of exciting "discontent among the slaves."[11] The *Colored American* reprinted portions of an Ohio antislavery pamphlet that explained the status of some free people of color. "Enfranchised" former slaves were said to be property owners, professionals, and members of military regiments, and according to the tract, "the benefits arising from them have disposed the whites to think of making free the whole negro population."[12] Even before the *Constitution* set out, Hackett held a sophisticated if incomplete picture of the dynamics produced at the convergence of race and rights.[13]

The first leg of the *Constitution*'s voyage was a diplomatic mission, and talk of politics filled the commodore's quarters. The dignitary aboard was Powhatan Ellis, the new U.S. minister plenipotentiary to Mexico. Ellis was a southerner, appointed by President Martin Van Buren to smooth over claims against the United States by its southern neighbor. The ship needed twenty-seven days to sail between New York and the port of Sacrificios, off Veracruz. Along the way, the crew had its first encounters with men who traded with sea vessels—local sellers who supplied passing ships with foodstuffs. As the frigate passed the Cayman Islands, it was visited by several canoes loaded with fresh fruit and stew turtles that were purchased for the pleasure of the crew.[14] Was there an exchange of news? The logbooks are silent, though queries likely were made: it was only the second contact the *Constitution* had had with others since leaving New York.

Along the way, the commodore and the minister shared meals, politics, and gossip. Had Hackett listened in while performing his duties, he would have learned about Ellis's orders. In the wake of Texas's independence, U.S.-Mexican relations had been suspended. Resurrecting healthy diplomatic ties required se-

curing satisfaction for American claims regarding the Mexican seizure of ships, cargo, and crews in Mexican ports or waters; winning the release of Americans imprisoned in Mexico, including several U.S. consuls; and obtaining satisfaction on unpaid bills for supplies delivered to Mexicans.[15] Beyond formalities, the elephant in the room was the future of Texas. Formal debate over its annexation remained suppressed. Still, the American Anti-Slavery Society and others working against the spread of slavery opposed annexation of the newest slaveholding republic in the Americas.[16] John Quincy Adams saw annexation as part of slavery's expansion and slaveholders' increasing power. In the late 1830s, Texas had about five thousand enslaved people, with more being brought into the republic each day.[17] When the question arose, Ellis may have offered the administration's party line: annexation was off the table. But it is unlikely that he opposed the prospect of expanding slavery at some point in the future. Claxton's position is more difficult to discern.

The politics of race also manifested themselves in quotidian ways during this first leg of the tour. In the banter and barbs that passed between crew members were echoes of the racism that men like Hackett knew well and that was woven into the fabric of everyday life. Henry Mercier published his recollections of the *Constitution*'s Pacific tour, and some black crew members, especially the cooks and barbers, drew his attention. According to Mercier, a white sailor, Pat Bradley, referred sarcastically to the ship's black barber as "fashionable" and to the wardroom cook as the "colored gemman": black men who displayed respectable pretensions were the targets of white sailors' derision.[18]

The *Constitution* spent just twenty-four hours in Veracruz itself, too little time for Hackett to observe life in the port city. He did experience diplomatic protocol and pomp, however, as Ellis and his retinue received a seventeen-gun salute when they disembarked. The crew assembled on deck, in uniform, overseeing the ritual like sentries before departing early the next morning.[19] Bound for Cuba, the frigate cut across the Gulf of Mexico. Anticipation was heightened. The frigate would spend some days in Havana Harbor, taking on supplies and discharging personnel before the long trek to Rio de Janeiro. The frigate arrived on July 3, signaled for a pilot ship, and then carefully navigated the narrow harbor entrance as the Moro and Punta Castles watched over the scene. David Turnbull, British consul to Cuba, described the port as the "safest, best defended, and most capacious in the world." At one end were the wharves of Havana, which serviced merchant ships. Just opposite sat what Turnbull called "the village of Casa Blanca, the notorious resort of the slavers" who frequented the Cuban port. Between the two there was space for several hundred ships to rest at anchor.[20] The *Constitution* took its place among them.

Free black sailors were not welcome in Havana, a fact that Hackett and the *Constitution*'s other free black crew members likely knew. In 1837, the *Colored American* had warned that black sailors arriving in Cuba from the United States risked being held in jail until their vessel was ready to depart. Even more serious, those convicted of seditious behavior would be "executed or else sold into slavery."[21] Writing from Matanzas, William Gibbs reported, "No colored seamen are allowed to come to this Island from the United States; if they do they are locked up in prison and tried for their lives; if convicted they are executed or else sold into perpetual slavery; if not convicted they are kept in prison until the ship is ready for sea, and then sent on board."[22] Gibbs had in mind the case of George Davison, a "colored citizen . . . and a tailor" who was arrested and then sentenced to death without trial. Only the intervention of highly placed officials spared him. U.S. congressman Churchill Cambreleng of New York stepped in, promising to bring the imprisonment of "colored Mariners" to the attention of the secretary of state. Davison, who was from Jamaica, was eventually released with the help of the British consul.[23] The lesson remained. Cuban ports were risky for free people of color, and a claim to citizenship or subjecthood might prove decisive. Lawmakers and consular officials acted on behalf of state interests, extending influence on behalf of those entitled to such protections.

Had no one thought through the status of the free black crew members prior to arrival in Havana, the question was unavoidable once the ship dropped anchor. There, across the harbor, was the HMS *Romney*, a vivid sign of the fraught status of free black mariners. According to historian Michele Reid-Vazquez, by 1832, legislation sought to exclude Jamaican freedmen, whom Cuban officials considered a "dangerous class." After emancipation in the British Caribbean, Cuba extended its prohibition against free blacks' access to port cities in 1837.[24] The *Romney* was a hulk, no longer seaworthy but serving as a temporary hold for Africans seized by British antislavery patrols. More controversial was the fate of black British sailors aboard the hulk. They, too, were barred from entering the port of Havana. The *Romney* provoked extended diplomatic wrangling, and its presence in the harbor aimed to draw attention to the dilemma that free black sailors confronted.[25]

None of the *Constitution*'s black seamen disembarked at Havana. Most comings and goings involved Cuban locals who delivered supplies—water, meat, vegetables, and fruit—that would sustain the crew during the long voyage to Brazil. News was certainly exchanged, and the men on board may have had time to glean a sense of life in the nearby port city. The only men who disembarked were those said to be unfit for the next stage of the *Constitution*'s itinerary. What

they saw of life in Havana was lore to be told aboard another vessel bound north to the United States.[26]

Leaving Havana behind, the *Constitution* set its sights on the Pacific. The long journey to Valparaiso would take the frigate around Cape Horn but would also include a respite in Rio de Janeiro. This leg of the trip was completed in thirty-three days.[27] Mercier described the days at sea as filled by the telling of sailors' tall tales.[28] The logbooks, however, emphasize regular drills—stations to be maintained, formations to be memorized, muskets to be readied.[29] Officers were in state of low but steady anxiety about discipline, with regular and occasionally surprise musters intended to keep the crew sharp and ready.[30]

Two weeks in Rio de Janeiro meant shore leave for many crew members who had not left the *Constitution*'s deck since New York. Men disembarked overnight, with their comings and goings carefully accounted for.[31] Both the logbooks and Mercier's memoir are silent about what men might have done during their brief time ashore, but if later impressions from Valparaiso are any indicator, these brief excursions generally were spent in the bars and brothels that surrounded the port.

In Rio, like Baltimore, free men and women of color made their way in a slaveholding city. But Rio's scale was unknown in the United States. It was home to the largest urban community of former slaves in the Americas, people freed by way of seizure in the slave trade or through military service, compensated emancipation, self-purchase, government service, and individual manumissions.[32] Historians Herbert Klein and Francisco Vidal Luna emphasize that under Brazil's imperial constitution of 1824, free people of color were citizens equal to all others. Still, law constrained their rights.[33] All free men could vote, but only freeborn men could hold office or serve as electors. Freedmen were barred from becoming officers in the National Guard, were subject to curfews, and could not carry weapons. Sumptuary laws denied free women of color the ability to wear the styles of clothing and jewelry worn by free white women.[34] But there were also guarantees. Freedpeople could marry and form families, and their children were legitimate. They controlled their wages and property and operated independent businesses. While they had the right to travel, those who left the city risked being charged as fugitives and being reenslaved.[35] Civic life was organized through church-based confraternities in which free people of color collected funds, ran burial societies, and sponsored parades and festivals.[36]

In many respects, life for free people of color in Rio was organized around the same questions confronted by Hackett and others in Baltimore. In both cities, black laws sought to fix the status and ambitions of free people. What marked the Brazilian capital as distinct was the presence of African-born men and women

freed by the mixed commissions that adjudicated disputes generated by the illegal slave trade. These former captives, *Africanos livres*, had a separate status, severely constrained in their rights and privileges. They were, in essence, a class between free people of color and slaves. Historian Beatriz Mamigonian explains how discrimination against *Africanos livres* grew during the course of the nineteenth century. Their citizenship was limited, and they were barred from voting, officeholding, enlisting in the military, and joining religious orders. Their spatial mobility was controlled by the obligation to carry a passport. They were bound laborers subject to a term of service.[37] Baltimore knew no such in-between class, no group situated as a buffer between free persons and slaves.

Hackett likely would only have learned about Rio secondhand from crew members who enjoyed a day's leave in Rio: as the commodore's steward, he likely remained on board. Claxton's quarters were busier than usual, with diplomats and local dignitaries ferried out to the frigate to make formal calls. Meals needed to be prepared and served, wine uncorked and poured, and linens and dishes changed. During the ship's sojourn in Rio de Janeiro, representatives of Sardinia, Russia, Britain, and the United States paid formal visits to Claxton. The commodore likely dressed for the occasion, sporting his full regalia.[38]

The *Constitution*'s turn around Cape Horn was harrowing. Sighting of the snowcapped mountain generated excitement, and according to Mercier, nearly everyone on board came up on deck to catch a glimpse. The calm weather, coupled with the tricks that distance played with the peak's size, led some to discount stories about the furor that awaited. Within a few hours, however, storm clouds ushered in drenching rains and gale-strength winds. The ship was sealed tight, and men belowdecks endured a dramatic pitch and roll that made it nearly impossible to pass soup from bowl to lips. Seasickness, falls, and collisions were common. After seventeen tortuous days, the coast of Chile finally appeared on the horizon.[39]

What could a free man of color expect to encounter at Valparaiso and up the coast at Callao? South America's west coast republics had never been as dependent on enslaved African labor as were Cuba and Brazil. Chile abolished slavery in 1823 and by the 1830s had enacted a policy of *blanqueamiento* (whitening) that sought to use an influx of European immigration to erase the visible presence of Africans. The government promised land grants to attract European laborers and later established workshops for their benefit.[40] There was no reason to expect that the presence of free black sailors would generate alarm among local authorities.

As in Rio de Janeiro, Hackett's service to the commodore kept him aboard ship more than most of his fellow crew members. Still, he did not want for

opportunities to learn about legal culture. Leave was liberally granted during the many months that the *Constitution* spent patrolling up and down South America's western seaboard. But the commodore's quarters remained busy with visiting dignitaries and a new set of challenges: serious disciplinary infractions. The naval frigate that had served so well as a diplomatic shuttle, conveyance of U.S. imperial authority, and superintendent of the seas now became a courthouse. As discipline waned, especially as crew members had many more occasions to frequent port vice districts, the *Constitution* became a courtroom in which men were charged, tried, and punished for infractions of discipline and the dereliction of duty.

Some proceedings were less formal and summary in nature, and black sailors played a role in such cases. Mercier termed the frigate's mainmast the "tribunal of justice in a man-of-war," meaning that when a crowd gathered there, an officer was at the center conducting an investigation. On one occasion, a first lieutenant heard about the pilfering of food. The chief complainant was a man who accused two fellow sailors of stealing his much-coveted dish of "dunderfunk." A "whole posse of witnesses," including black men, assembled, and "Swampseed," an African American cook, reported that the accused were reputedly regular food thieves, though he had not seen them lift the dish in question. The testimony proved inconclusive, leading the lieutenant to advise the complainant to better safeguard his food stores.[41] In other cases, black sailors witnessed the outcomes of these informal proceedings: punishment. Such was the case in December 1839, for example, when four "liberty men" failed to return from a day's break in the port of Callao. The logbook does not reflect how the informal inquiry unfolded, but ten days later, all hands were summoned to the deck to witness the punishment of the four for desertion and drunkenness. Each received twelve lashes.[42]

Serious infractions led the commodore to convene courts-martial in cases of internal disciplinary infractions and courts of inquiry to hear disputes between the ship and civilians. These courts applied naval law, conducting preliminary investigations, interviewing witnesses, and presenting charges. Commodore Claxton then determined whether the proceeding would go forward. When it did, he formally appointed officers to preside and serve as advocate general. An 1839 case against James Morris alleged "mutinous conduct"—specifically, aiding another marine, William Bambury, in an assault on an officer. The charges—violation of the "13th 14th and 15th articles for the better government of the Navy"—were signed by Lieutenant J. C. Rich and then transmitted to Claxton. In his letter of transmittal, Captain Turner appealed to Claxton. Morris had been acting on orders that required him to protect Bambury, who

was a prisoner. Claxton exercised his discretion and opted not to convene a court-martial.[43]

Claxton wasted little time organizing a court of inquiry, however, when he received a letter of complaint from the minister of foreign affairs of the imperial government of Brazil to the Rio-based U.S. chargé d'affaires. Four officers were appointed: three presidents and an advocate general. The defendant, Commander French Forrest of the USS *St. Louis*, stood accused of negligence during a stopover in Rio during which the Brazilian brig *Amisada* had suffered "immense damage." Claxton ordered Forrest to answer the charges, while the tribunal was to obtain testimony, record the facts, and prepare a written report. Over three days in December 1839, the matter of Forrest's performance was scrutinized, and the final report declared, "The damage done to the Guard vessel was very trifling and [the court] acquits Commander Forrest of negligence."[44]

These sorts of instances offered Hackett the opportunity to observe legal culture firsthand and to ruminate on the contrasts between the role of race aboard a naval frigate and in the Baltimore city courthouse. In Baltimore, only black men and women were still subject to public flogging for criminal offenses. Aboard a naval vessel, such punishments knew no color line, and nearly all those who nursed wounds and bore scars were white men. Black crew members might testify against their white counterparts. An observant crewman with access to the commodore's quarters would have had ample occasion to learn how legal culture worked from the inside out.

Hackett's time aboard the *Constitution* was cut short in March 1841 after Claxton died of dysentery.[45] With his services no longer necessary, Hackett was returned to the United States. Other officers arranged for Hackett to board a whaler out of Valparaiso, carrying with him one hundred pounds of bread, one pound of port, and five gallons of vinegar.[46] Before he left, the steward had one last occasion to take part in maritime culture, joining the commodore's funeral retinue. During Claxton's funeral in Valparaiso, a procession ushered the body from the port to its final resting place. At its head was the ship's band, in uniform with "the sombre drapery of death pendent from each instrument." Following were the marine guard, the chaplain, and eight naval officers who served as pallbearers. And then came Hackett and the rest of the commodore's staff, "body servants . . . their downcast countenances proclaiming how severely they felt this sudden and unexpected bereavement." Only after these men did foreign consuls and naval captains join the line.[47] The following day, Hackett boarded the whaler *Ann*, bound for Nantucket.[48]

The *Ann* did not reach its destination for three and a half months. As he disembarked, Hackett stepped into a new scene. Walking the narrow streets

of Nantucket, he was fully immersed in the North's African American public culture. The island was an antislavery hotbed. Just months earlier, a young Frederick Douglass had delivered his first address to a predominantly white antislavery audience. Agents and correspondents for the black and antislavery press, including Edward Pompey and George Bradburn, made their homes there. Above a general store was Nantucket's "Anti-Slavery Library," which offered "free of expense" publications intended to further the cause. Hackett may have heard talk of Douglass's speech or borrowed copies of the *Colored American* or the *Liberator* to catch up on events closer to home.

Though he may have lingered in New England, Hackett was on his way home. Baltimore remained a remarkable crossroads, with the North, the South, and the Atlantic meeting along its streets and in its port. This perspective was a powerful one for free African Americans who watched as the status of people of color transformed throughout the Americas. Free black Baltimoreans evaluated their own status through the lenses of gradual abolition to the North, the domestic slave trade to the South, and revolutionary freedom in Haiti and Latin America. If world events provided food for thought, closer to home legal culture aimed to place blinders on free black aspirations. Law turned out to be a muddled patchwork of ideas. Even the nation's most highly esteemed lawmakers and judges could not resolve with precision the matter of free black citizenship.

How Hackett put these pieces together it is hard to say. If he wrote down how he saw the world, those writings have been lost, so we must infer his thoughts from his actions. Three years after his return to the United States, Hackett reappeared in the historical record as the complainant in an assault case against a white man, John Pitts. The ship's steward-turned-caterer had been physically violated by Pitts. The nature of their dispute is not known, but whatever happened, Hackett, now thirty-eight years old and employed as a carter, responded by seeking redress through the courts. Doing so required Hackett to secure the assistance of a watchman or sheriff to charge Pitts with a criminal offense. He must have had some expectation that he would receive satisfaction or at least a fair hearing, and his expectations were indeed met. Pitts was tried, found guilty, and fined a customary one dollar plus court costs.[49]

George Hackett then spent the next two and a half decades as a courthouse regular—not as a party to assault cases but as an activist who insisted that black Americans were citizens. Hackett mixed his hard-earned legal acumen with that of fellow black activists who had "studied" in church tribunals and before justices of the peace, by reading African American newspapers and attending black political conventions. Their accumulated legal consciousness under-

girded sophisticated arguments and shrewd interventions that took free black men and women into the era of the Civil War and Reconstruction, consistently claiming the privileges and immunities of citizens. Hackett's story reminds us how, even as the quest for equal citizenship took on a particular shape in each local setting, black men and women living in the Age of Emancipations were bound to one another across empires, republics, and nations in the quest for citizenship.

NOTES

1. Christopher Phillips, *Freedom's Port: The African American Community of Baltimore, 1790–1860* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1997), 160.

2. W. Jeffrey Bolster, *Black Jacks: African American Seamen in the Age of Sail* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1998).

3. On the USS *Constitution* generally, see Charles E. Brodine Jr., Michael J. Crawford, and Christine F. Hughes, *Interpreting Old Ironsides: An Illustrated Guide to U.S.S. Constitution* (Washington, D.C.: Naval Historical Center, Department of the Navy, 2007).

4. Alexander Claxton to Francis Sorrell, March 24, 1839, Alexander Claxton Letters, Southern Historical Collection, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.

5. Ibid.

6. Communipaw [James McCune Smith], "Heads of the Colored People—No. 5—The Steward," *Frederick Douglass' Paper* (Rochester), December 24, 1852.

7. "Monthly Return of Officers and Crew of the U.S.S. *Constitution*, January 31, 1841," M1030, Logbooks and Journals of the USS Constitution, 1798–1934, Logbooks of U.S. Navy Ships, ca. 1801–1940, Department of the Navy, Office of the Secretary, 1798–1934, Record Group 24: Records of the Bureau of Naval Personnel, 1798–2007, National Archives and Records Administration, Washington, D.C. (hereafter Constitution Logbooks).

8. Tyrone G. Martin, *A Most Fortunate Ship: A Narrative History of Old Ironsides* (Annapolis: Naval Institute Press, 1997).

9. On seamen's protection certificates and the debates over black mariners generally, see Philip M. Hamer, "Great Britain, the United States, and the Negro Seamen Acts, 1822–1848," *Journal of Southern History* 1, no. 1 (February 1935): 3–28; Michael Schoeppner, "Legitimating Quarantine: Moral Contagions, the Commerce Clause, and the Limits of Gibbons v. Ogden," *Journal of Southern Legal History* 17, nos. 1–2 (2009): 81–120.

10. "Evidence Concerning the Effects of Immediate Emancipation," *Colored American*, June 3, 1837; "Resolutions Adopted by the A.A.A. Society," *Colored American*, June 10, 1837; "For the Colored American," *Colored American*, October 21, 1837; Benjamin Lundy, *The War in Texas: Review of Facts and Circumstances* (Philadelphia: Merrihew and Gunn, 1836).

11. "Good News—George Davison Released," *Colored American*, June 16, 1838.

12. "Ohio Memorial—Extract No. 5," *Colored American*, April 12, 1838; A. Wattles and A. Hopkins, *Memorial to the General Assembly of the State of Ohio* (Cincinnati: Pugh & Dodd, 1838; published with the support of the Ohio Anti-Slavery Society). See Ohio Anti-Slavery Society, *Report of the Third Anniversary of the Ohio Anti-Slavery Society, Held in Granville, Licking County, Ohio, on the 30th of May, 1838* (Cincinnati: Alley, 1838).

13. Historians of the twentieth century would come to more systematically compare the regimes of slavery and post-slavery societies in the Americas. Still, Hackett's example suggests how such comparison was already taking place as free black people in the United States surveyed the hemisphere for measures of their status and strategies for their activism. Frank Tannenbaum's *Slave and Citizen: The Negro in the Americas* (New York: Knopf, 1946) remains the touchstone text on this question. Tannenbaum has been importantly revisited by historian Alejandro de la Fuente, "Slave Law and Claims-Making in Cuba: The Tannenbaum Debate Revisited," *Law and History Review* 22, no. 2 (Summer 2004): 339–69; Alejandro de la Fuente, "From Slaves to Citizens? Tannenbaum and the Debates on Slavery, Emancipation, and Race Relations in Latin America," *International Labor and Working-Class History* 77, no. 1 (Spring 2010): 154–73. Several volumes have further evidenced the insight to be gained from comparative thinking about free people of color in the Americas. See David W. Cohen and Jack P. Greene, eds., *Neither Slave nor Free: The Freedman of African Descent in the Slave Societies of the New World* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1972); Jane G. Landers, ed., *Against the Odds: Free Blacks in the Slave Societies of the Americas* (London: Cass, 1996); Robert Cottrol, *The Long, Lingering Shadow: Slavery, Race, and Law in the American Hemisphere* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2013).

14. For a description of the resulting feast, see Henry James Mercier and William Gallop, *Life in a Man-of-War; or, Scenes in "Old Ironsides" during Her Cruise in the Pacific, by a Fore-Top-Man* (Philadelphia: Bailey, 1841), 34.

15. Dean B. Mahin, *Olive Branch and Sword: The United States and Mexico, 1845–1848* (Jefferson, N.C.: McFarland, 1997), 17–29.

16. "Resolutions Adopted by the A.A.S. Society," *Colored American*, June 10, 1837; "Celebration of the 3rd Anniversary," *Colored American*, July 29, 1837.

17. Joel H. Silbey, *Storm over Texas: The Annexation Controversy and the Road to Civil War* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), 7–10.

18. Mercier and Gallop, *Life in a Man-of-War*, 30. According to Sidney Kaplan, Herman Melville borrowed from Mercier's text when constructing his black characters ("Herman Melville and the American National Sin: The Meaning of Benito Cereno," in *American Studies in Black and White: Selected Essays, 1949–1989* [Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1996]).

19. Mercier and Gallop, *Life in a Man-of-War*, 38; Brodine, Crawford, and Hughes, *Interpreting Old Ironsides*, 75; "Constitution Deposited the Minister to Mexico, Powhatan Ellis, at Veracruz before Proceeding to Valparaiso" quoted in Martin, *Most Fortunate Ship*, 257.

20. David Turnbull, *Travels in the West: Cuba, with Notice of Porto Rico, and the Slave Trade* (London: Longman, Orme, Brown, Green, and Longmans, 1840), 198–202. Turnbull was in the Caribbean from 1837 to 1839.

21. Michele Reid-Vazquez, *The Year of the Lash: Free People of Color in Cuba and the Nineteenth-Century Atlantic World* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2011), 72–74.

22. William A. Gibbs, "A Caution to Travelers in General," *Colored American*, October 21, 1837.

23. "Postscript!!," *Colored American*, March 15, 1838; "Good News—George Davison Released," *Colored American*, June 16, 1838. Jane Landers explains how the Davison case evidences the circulation of abolitionist literature in Matanzas. Davison had traversed the Americas from Jamaica to New Orleans, to Cuba, to New York, and then back to Cuba. See Jane Landers, *Atlantic Creoles in the Age of Revolutions* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2011), 215–19, 317 n. 34.

24. Reid-Vazquez, *Year of the Lash*, 72–74; Franklin W. Knight, *Slave Society in Cuba During the Nineteenth Century* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1970), 96–97; Turnbull, *Travels in the West*, 70; William A. Gibbs, "A Caution to Travelers in General," *Colored American*, October 21, 1837.

25. Landers notes that Gibbs was briefly detained and interrogated in Matanzas, reporting that he was a black carpenter from New York without a passport (*Atlantic Creoles*, 218–19, 317 n. 34). The *Romney* dispute continued until 1839. Authorities in Madrid conceded to the admission of some black sailors into Havana in April 1839. Endless bickering followed. The British charged that the facilities allotted for the soldiers' exercise were unsanitary, while locals complained that the black soldiers were arrogant. Moreover, the men were being lured into local homes with alcohol. Soldiers were occasionally detained in Havana, and Spanish officials inspected the *Romney* to inventory men and equipment. By the fall of 1839, so much trouble was being generated that the British considered removing it from the port, but only in 1845 did they finally sell the hulk to the Spanish. See David R. Murray, *Odious Commerce: Britain, Spain and the Abolition of the Cuban Slave Trade* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980), 114–27. I thank Roseanne Adderley for introducing me to her work on the meaning of the *Romney*.

26. Log, USS *Constitution*, July 4, 1839, Constitution Logbooks.

27. Ibid., August 28, 1839; Martin, *Most Fortunate Ship*, 258.

28. "Bill Garnet's Yarn" and "Pat Bradley's Yarn," in Mercier and Gallop, *Life in a Man-of-War*, 48–54, 55–59.

29. Ibid., 44–47.

30. Log, USS *Constitution*, various dates, Constitution Logbooks. Mercier described one such drill during the trip between Veracruz and Havana. See "The Sailor's Drill," in Mercier and Gallop, *Life in a Man-of-War*, 44–47.

31. Log, USS *Constitution*, September 3, 4, 1839, Constitution Logbooks.

32. Mary C. Karasch, *Slave Life in Rio de Janeiro, 1808–1850* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1987), 338–42.

33. Herbert S. Klein and Francisco Vidal Luna, *Slavery in Brazil* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 290–92.

34. Sylvia Hunold Lara, "Sedas, Panos, e Balangandas: O Traje de Senhors e Escravas nas Cidades do Rio de Janeiro e Salvador (Seculo XVIII)," in *Brasil: Colonizacao e Escravidao*, ed. Maria Beatriz Nizza de Silva (Rio de Janeiro: Nova Frontera, 1999), 177–91.

35. Karasch, *Slave Life*, 362–67. See also Klein and Luna, *Slavery in Brazil*.

36. Klein and Luna, *Slavery in Brazil*, 290–92.

37. Beatriz Gallotti Mamigonian, "To Be a Liberated African in Brazil: Labour and Citizenship in the Nineteenth Century" (PhD diss., University of Waterloo, 2002), 28–29, 30.

38. Log, USS *Constitution*, August 28, 31, September 2, 6, 7, November 2, 1839, Constitution Logbooks. Hackett and the other members of his staff do not appear on the roster of those who took liberty time during the two-week stopover.

39. Mercier and Gallop, *Life in a Man-of-War*, 75–78.

40. Tanya Kateri Hernandez, *Racial Subordination in Latin America: The Role of the State, Customary Law, and the New Civil Rights Response* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 31–34. See also Richard Gott, "Latin America as a White Settler Society," *Bulletin of Latin American Research* 26, no. 2 (April 2007): 269–89.

41. Mercier and Gallop, *Life in a Man-of-War*, 165–70.

42. Log, USS *Constitution*, December 12, 22, 1839, Constitution Logbooks.

43. Lieutenant William H. Kennon, "Charges and Specification of Charles (William Bambury)," December 19, 1839, Lieutenant J. C. Rich, "Charge and Specification (James Morris)," December 20, 1839, Captain Daniel Turner to Commodore Alexander Claxton, December 20, 1839, all in Letterbook of Captain Daniel Turner, Record Group 45: Naval Records Collection of the Office of Naval Records and Library, National Archives and Records Administration.

44. Commodore Alexander Claxton to Captain Daniel Turner, December 22, 1839, Captain Daniel Turner to Lieutenant T. D. Shaw, December 25, 1839, Captain Daniel Turner to Lieutenant William Smith, December 25, 1839, Captain Daniel Turner to Flag Lieutenant Franklin Buchanan, December 25, 1839, Captain Daniel Turner, Report of the Court of Inquiry, December 27, 1839, all in ibid.

45. Captain Daniel Turner to Honorable, the Secretary of the Navy, March 7, 1841, in ibid.

46. Log, USS *Constitution*, March 3, 1841, Constitution Logbooks.

47. Mercier and Gallop, *Life in a Man-of-War*, 188–89; Captain Daniel Turner to Captain Isaac McKeever, March 13, 1841, Letterbook of Captain Daniel Turner.

48. Log, USS *Constitution*, March 3, 1841, Constitution Logbooks.

49. "Baltimore City Court," *Sun* (Baltimore), August 5, 1844.

PART 3

Labor and Freedom

This page intentionally left blank

Apprenticeship and Emancipation in the Caribbean

The Seeds of Citizenship

GAD HEUMAN

Unfree labor did not come to an end in the anglophone Caribbean in 1834. Although the enslaved were declared legally free on August 1, they were obliged to serve a period of apprenticeship to their former masters. This meant that ex-slaves were legally obligated to work without compensation for their former masters for up to forty-five hours per week. Their term of continued compulsory labor depended on their status: former field slaves (*praedials*) were to be apprenticed for six years, while skilled apprentices and domestics (non-*praedials*) were to be fully free after four years. Because of the terms of the apprenticeship system, many contemporary observers as well as some historians have regarded it as a new form of slavery.[1]

However, Thomas Holt has called the apprenticeship "a half-way covenant," since the relationship between the planter and the worker was much the same as slavery during part of the week, although the remaining time was negotiable.[2] After serving their former masters for the requisite number of hours each week, ex-slaves were free to negotiate conditions of work and wages with their former masters or with another employer. Moreover, the legislation establishing apprenticeship prohibited former masters from punishing their former slaves. Instead, special magistrates were appointed, largely from England, to adjudicate disputes between erstwhile masters and slaves. Lord Sligo, the governor of Jamaica, recognized the crucial role of these magistrates in an August 1834 proclamation to the apprentices of Jamaica: "Neither your master, your overseer, your book-keeper, your driver, nor any other person can strike you, or put you into the stocks, nor can you be punished at all, except by the order of a Special Magistrate."[3]

But apprentices across the Caribbean resisted the establishment of the apprenticeship system. Moreover, even before apprenticeship ended in 1838, many former slaves were unwilling to accept freedom on such terms. In addition,

some apprentices never accepted the different lengths of apprenticeship for field and skilled laborers envisioned in the legislation. Apprentices not only imagined freedom very differently from their former masters but also began to see themselves as citizens.

Even before the onset of apprenticeship, there were early signs of trouble. In St. Kitts, the enslaved indicated that they would resist apprenticeship and would strike on August 1, 1834. As they explained to the island's lieutenant governor, J. Lyons Nixon, they would "only work for wages, and that they will dictate terms, being convinced from the King's Proclamation that they are to have unrestricted freedom on the 1st August next."[4]

Faced with this outburst, Nixon toured the island, speaking to blacks from every estate. The lieutenant governor sought to clarify the basic provisions of the system and emphasized that the enslaved would need to continue to work after the abolition of slavery. However, his addresses failed to calm blacks, who remained hostile and in at least one instance threatened an overseer with violence. According to Nixon, the people in two parishes near the capital were "highly insubordinate and disgraceful. They *una voce* protested against the apprenticeship system, declaring their resolution to resist it, and not to work after the 1st of August without wages, saying that on that day they were to be free, as announced by the King's proclamation, and that their masters could not take their houses or provision-grounds from them, having so long occupied them."[5]

Serious difficulties arose at the onset of apprenticeship elsewhere in the Caribbean as well. In Trinidad, the apprentices vowed to strike and reiterated some of the same themes as the apprentices in St. Kitts. The hostility toward apprenticeship was equally strong in British Guiana. Apprentices in the province of Essequibo occupied a church and a churchyard for three days beginning on August 9, flew flags, and generally sought to encourage local residents to resist apprenticeship.[6]

In the Jamaican parish of St. Ann, apprentices went on strike, vowing not to work except for wages. One report claimed that the apprentices swore that "they will have their heads cut off, or shot, before they will be bound as apprentices." As in other parts of the Caribbean, apprentices questioned whether the king could be responsible for the legislation or whether it instead emanated from Jamaica. They asked the authorities a series of rather telling questions: "1st. Is it the King's law? 2d. Would you swear that the King make it? 3d. Did not the Jamaica House make it? 4. Did not Lord Sligo put him name to it because him have slaves? 5. Could you swear it is the Law of Jesus Christ?"[7]

Another level of protest was more generalized and more difficult to control. James Scott has described this behavior of peasants in terms of "hidden

transcripts," using "foot-dragging" or "poaching" as part of an everyday form of resistance. Apprentices in Jamaica employed such tactics. Governor Sligo commented on the reaction of many apprentices who were unhappy with the new system: they resorted to "turning out late, irregularity to work, and idling of time." To some degree, these "delinquencies" were dealt with by the special magistrates, but planters also perceived "insolence and insubordination" among the former slaves. The use of language was significant in this context: a special magistrate, E. D. Baynes, reported that the apprentice was "daily becoming more heedless of and more disrespectful to his manager." According to Baynes, apprentices were no longer willing to accept the language of their former owners without an appropriate retort.[8]

The reaction of the apprentices in the first year of the apprenticeship was highly revealing. Apprentices' images of freedom clearly differed substantially from those of policymakers in the Colonial Office as well as former masters. For the apprentices, and especially those who resisted the establishment of apprenticeship, it was difficult to comprehend the new system. They felt that they needed no "apprenticeship"—no training for freedom or for their plantation work. In fact, the nature of the slaves' economy in the Caribbean, with its extensive provision-ground system and highly developed markets, meant that the enslaved were probably better prepared for freedom than were their former masters.[9] At the onset of apprenticeship, ex-slaves wanted to be fully free: they sought "unrestricted freedom" and not a system of forced labor, even for part of the week.

Yet the apprenticeship system placed considerable obstacles in the path of the former slaves. For example, many planters sought to extract the maximum amount of labor possible in this period and to deny apprentices the indulgences and allowances that they had received during slavery. In theory, the Abolition Act allowed apprentices the same allowances they had received during slavery. But since many of these allowances were a matter of customary practice rather than legislative statute, considerable numbers of masters withheld these allowances. Field labor gangs were denied water carriers, and field cooks for the gangs were also removed. During slavery, mothers of six or more children were exempt from field labor, but in many places, planters discontinued this practice and sent these women to work in the field. Similarly, aged and infirm former slaves who had also been exempt from field labor had to work in the fields. One of the stipendiary magistrates commented at length and bitterly about these policies:

> This feeling has doubtlessly originated in a splenetic and exasperated feeling on the part of the planters, who, compelled to emancipate his slaves, for what he

> maintained at the time . . . to be an insufficient consideration, showed too generally . . . a perverse disposition to harass and oppress the apprentices, withholding from him every assistance and indulgence, though customary in the days of slavery, which the strictest interpretation of the statue would bear out; rigidly exacting the whole law from him . . . dragging him before the special justice on occasions the most trivial . . . too often manifesting a discreditable anxiety for the severe infliction of the lash; [and] exclaiming intemperately against [and] affronting [them] by gross and offensive language.[10]

During the apprenticeship period, there were also serious difficulties over the way the planters scheduled the apprentices' work time. In Jamaica, the Abolition Law stipulated that apprentices had to work 40.5 hours per week for their former masters, but the law did not state how that time should be organized. The planters in Jamaica almost immediately adopted an eight-hour workday, which meant that apprentices had little time to cultivate their provision grounds, since Saturday was their market day and they were not supposed to cultivate their grounds on Sundays. The apprentices wanted to work a nine-hour day from Monday to Thursday and a half day on Fridays to allow them to work their grounds on that day, but their masters would not allow this. Swithin Wilmot has suggested that this schedule not only inconvenienced the apprentices but also "prevented them from pursuing alternative occupations to working on the estates. The apprentices were to be kept dependent on the estates for their livelihood so that when full freedom came they would have been accustomed to look to the estates for earnings."[11]

There was an additional problem about the way planters regulated the work time of their apprentices to their own advantage. A stipendiary magistrate in Jamaica, Edmund Lyon, described a system in which, during the shorter days of the year, the planters allowed a couple of hours a day for meal breaks. However, during the longer spring and summer days, planters kept the same time for breaks but had the apprentices start work earlier and finish later. The result could be a workweek for the apprentices of an additional ten hours. The apprentices complained to Lyon, but he noted the difficulty of proving this practice since very few apprentices had watches.[12]

It was clear that the role of the stipendiary magistrates was to adjudicate disputes between the apprentices and their former owners. But the magistrates were sometimes stymied by the reluctance of apprentices to complain to them. One of the stipendiary magistrates in western Jamaica, J. W. Grant, reported that planters withheld allowances for the apprentices if they complained to the magistrates. Grant reported the reaction of an overseer in the face of such a

complaint: "a few women came to complain that the nurses were taken away from their children by the overseer, and that he made use of the most brutal and insulting language in addressing them; for this, and because some of the others happened to ask a few questions about their rights, notice has been given that unless all the [live]stock etc, which they were allowed to rear on the property are taken up within a certain time, they will be shot."[13]

Some of the stipendiary magistrates themselves were responsible for the harsh punishments of apprentices. The surviving diary of a stipendiary magistrate in Jamaica, Frederick White, offers a glimpse of the severity of some of the punishments meted out by these magistrates and the occasional response of an apprentice. White was particularly upset by apprentices disobeying his orders and, as he put it, "[putting] me at defiance." He found four men guilty of this behavior within a couple of weeks of the beginning of the apprenticeship system and ordered each to receive thirty-six lashes; in addition, two women received fourteen days hard labor in the workhouse. White believed that another apprentice, Thomas Catney, was also insolent and would not go to work, again in the middle of August 1834. White had Catney given thirty-six lashes and reported in his diary "that this man had the impudence to tell me that I was paid by the White Man & not by the King, for which I gave him the extra 12 lashes."[14]

For White, these were not unusual responses. White reported on the case of some "badly disposed" apprentices on an estate who, he claimed, were the cause of all the apprentices being dissatisfied. Since the overseer had already explained the law to them, the hostile "reception I met with then called for me to make a very severe example"—thirty-six lashes for these men as well. In another case, White dealt even more severely with the headman of an estate who allegedly had encouraged other apprentices to strike and to perform less work than was required. White ordered him to receive forty-eight lashes.[15]

Yet in a rare case in which an apprentice complained about having been struck by an overseer, White let the manager off with a warning. The manager admitted hitting the apprentice in the head, but White dismissed the case because no stick had been used. White was clearly overzealous in his use of the whip and was eventually dismissed, although over a different issue. But the number of floggings of apprentices generally—especially in the early years of the system—suggests that he was far from unique.[16]

Apprentices responded to these abuses and the attempt to control their labor in a variety of ways. For example, in the immediate aftermath of the abolition of slavery, apprentices were very reluctant to work beyond the time required by the new legislation. Apprentices were required to work for their former masters for up to forty-five hours per week; thereafter, they were free to hire their

labor or not to work at all. In some parts of the Caribbean, apprentices were determined to do much less work than they had as slaves. In British Guiana, for example, apprentices decided to do no more than half the work they had done under slavery; moreover, they knew this was "the King's order."[17] In Jamaica, Governor Sligo reported that the apprentices believed that working for wages would "perpetuate their slavery." Sligo worried that such views would result in a lack of labor to harvest the sugar crop.[18]

Sligo had expected difficulties along this line for the first month or two of the apprenticeship system but had assumed that apprentices would subsequently begin working for wages. Writing privately to the colonial secretary, Thomas Spring Rice, in October 1834, Sligo reported that apprentices were unwilling to work for wages and that he saw no likelihood of improvement in the situation since as the apprentices "begin by experience to acquire a better knowledge of the law they appear to become more resolute in their determination not to do one particle more of work than they are forced by the law." For Sligo, apprenticeship had changed the situation dramatically: apprentices were aware that they no longer faced punishment from their former masters. Since there were not enough stipendiary magistrates on the island, apprentices were not being punished as they should have been. Even worse, the apprentices had adopted "a system of passive resistance" in many instances.[19]

The situation greatly alarmed planters. One estate in the parish of St. Ann had nearly two hundred apprentices, but no stipendiary magistrates visited the plantation during the first three months of the apprenticeship system. From a situation at the beginning of August when the apprentices had been "civil, well behaved and obedient," things on the estate had changed dramatically. According to a planter with over thirty years' experience in Jamaica, by the end of October, apprentices "turn out to work when they like, do what they choose, take what days they like, in fact, do as they think proper."[20] A doctor who had lived in Jamaica for nearly twenty years and who was also a proprietor of a coffee estate, James Maxwell, believed that the apprentices had a wider agenda. By working as little as possible during the time required by the law and then refusing to do any paid work outside of it, apprentices were intent on destroying the apprenticeship system. Maxwell maintained that the planters would be unable to deal with the apprentices' lack of labor; if this pattern continued, the apprenticeship system would end prematurely. Apprentices would therefore be freed of their apprenticeships.[21]

Less than a year later, the situation had changed quite dramatically. Sligo noted in July 1835 that apprentices were working for wages on nearly three hundred estates in Jamaica, though they refused to do so on twenty-two others.

Sligo explained that some apprentices continued to equate paid labor with the possibility of perpetuating their enslavement, while other apprentices were unwilling to work for their own masters but did so for neighboring estates. It was important for Sligo to report this information: he was countering the planters' claims at a series of public meetings that apprentices had continued to refuse paid labor.[22]

A few months earlier, stipendiary magistrate W. Hewitt had painted a more mixed picture of Jamaican apprentices' attitudes regarding hiring out their labor. In the parish of St. George, some apprentices were working for wages, while others worked in exchange for the allowances they had received under slavery. Hewitt reported that other apprentices simply refused to work outside of the period that the law required.[23] Across the Caribbean, apprentices appear generally to have accepted working for wages. As two of the stipendiary magistrates in St. Vincent reported in the summer of 1837, apprentices there were eager to earn money, although some continued to work for their former allowances.[24]

Whatever their patterns of work, apprentices were prepared to initiate complaints about their masters to the stipendiary magistrates. In December 1834, Governor Sligo reported that apprentices had "lost all apprehensions now of the danger of making complaints, and avail themselves most abundantly of that privilege," although Sligo found many of the charges "frivolous."[25] Moreover, the stipendiary magistrates clearly were punishing some planters. Sligo believed that fines—particularly those imposed on overseers—would limit oppression of their apprentices. Despite overseers' denial of the charges against them, Sligo believed publishing such complaints would result in the overseers' dismissal.[26]

While many stipendiary magistrates doled out harsh punishments, others did not. A few months after the start of the apprenticeship system, planters in Jamaica were complaining about the relatively light punishments meted out by the stipendiary magistrates. Moreover, planters' representatives in the House of Assembly maintained that Sligo had instructed the special magistrates to decide all the cases against the planters. Some of the magistrates, among them William Norcott and Richard Hill in Montego Bay, were known opponents of corporal punishment. For Sligo, their refusal to hand out such punishments had led to the apprentices' passive resistance to the demands of the planters. As Sligo put it, "The Negroes when brought before any other Special laugh at him and their Masters and say they will go to Hill & Norcott, who won't allow them to be punished."[27] While this was a highly unusual stance, many apprentices were aware of the advantages of the apprenticeship system. As one of the stipendiary magistrates reported, the law was not what the apprentice

had wanted or expected, but "it is at least a protective one to him, and that by good behaviour he has the power of securing himself from the aggression of the tyrannical or the persecution of the vindictive."[28] As the governor of Barbados, Sir Murray MacGregor, noted in 1837, apprenticeship had transferred the power of punishment from the former master to the stipendiary magistrate, a clear improvement, MacGregor believed, over slavery.[29]

There was another advantage for the apprentices: unlike the enslaved, apprentices had the right to buy themselves out of apprenticeship. The process could be difficult, since the method of appraising the value of the apprentice's labor favored the former owners. Tribunals consisted of a stipendiary magistrate but also two colonial justices, local residents who might well have had an interest in apprenticed labor. An anonymous letter to the Colonial Office, apparently from an apprentice, also complained about this situation. Writing from Barbados soon after the beginning of the apprenticeship system in 1834, the apprentice criticized the oppressiveness of the system but specifically highlighted the exorbitant cost of appraisement. The apprentice concluded that "there has been many apprentices buying their time but the Price is too much . . . paying more than they would bring without emancipation."[30]

Yet it is clear that some apprentices were able to purchase their manumission. In a return of the Jamaican valuations from November 1, 1836, to July 31, 1837, over one thousand apprentices were successful in gaining valuations for their remaining time and were therefore manumitted. These apprentices paid a total of nearly thirty thousand pounds to their owners for their manumission. However, during the same period, almost half as many apprentices, about four hundred of them, found the valuations too high and were not manumitted.[31]

The reports of the stipendiary magistrates generally indicate a strong desire on the part of the apprentices to manumit themselves. Some wished to do so to avoid continued ill treatment by their masters, borrowing money to purchase their freedom and agreeing to work to repay the debt. Others similarly sought to work for different masters or mistresses or to unite families. One report suggested that many of the manumitted apprentices were young girls and boys, whom the parents manumitted so that the children could be educated or trained in a trade.

Whatever the motivations, few of the manumitted apprentices continued in field labor. As one apprentice reportedly said, "Who ever hear of free work a field?"[32] Many skilled apprentices continued at their trades, but many women left working as field laborers, preferring domestic work or trading as hucksters.

Table 1 shows that in Barbados, females were more likely than males to be manumitted and that non-*praedials* were more likely to gain their freedom than were *praedials*. Both findings are not surprising, especially in light of the prepon-

TABLE 1
Barbados, Number of Apprenticed Laborers Manumitted, 1837

District	Male	Female	*Praedials*	Non-*Praedials*	By Appraisal	By Agreement	Voluntarily	By Magistrate	Total
A-Town	155	268	75	348	36	146	241	2	425
A-Rural	62	71	41	92	56	42	35	2	135
B-Rural	65	98	59	104	70	31	62		163
C-Rural	70	109	98	81	129	21	29		179
D-Rural	20	26	31	15	45	1			46
E-Rural	72	115	78	109	91	36	60	4	191
F-Rural	22	23	30	15	40	5		8	53
G-Rural		2		1	1		2		2
TOTAL	466	712	403	775	467	282	429	16	1194

SOURCE: "General Return of Appeals of Apprenticed Labourers from the *Praedial* to the Non-*Praedial* Class, Barbados, June 14, 1838," Colonial Office Series 28/122, National Archives, Kew, London. Errors in the tabulation are in the original.

derance of female domestic workers among the apprenticed population. Most of these apprentices went through the process of appraisal, the official route for manumission, but a significant proportion were discharged by mutual agreement of the master and the apprentice or voluntarily (without payment). The total number of manumitted apprentices for 1837, almost twelve hundred, was significant.

The data also suggest that the number of apprentices gaining their freedom increased rather than decreased as the end of apprenticeship neared, at least for the non-*praedial* population. In 1837, two stipendiary magistrates in St. Vincent reported that apprentices strongly desired to purchase their manumission.[33] The following year, Barbados saw a rush to manumission despite the approaching end of the apprenticeship system. One of the stipendiary magistrates for Bridgetown, Henry Loving, reported in February that the non-*praedials* were "every day becoming more anxious for their Discharge, and that some who cannot obtain it by the usual means, exhibit such restiveness and bad conduct, as to oblige their Proprietors to dispense with the remaining term of Service rather than be tormented by such disaffected persons." A month later, Loving reported that the "intense longing for unequivocal freedom is the only motive by which the slave of 1833 is guided at this moment."[34] In his district, the number of appraisals rose each month, and by the early spring of 1838, before the Barbados legislature ended apprenticeship, masters were voluntarily freeing their apprentices.

Before this rush of voluntary manumission, there was a very revealing report from St. Vincent in early 1838 that the non-*praedials* were anxious to be manumitted, even at that late date, because they wanted to purchase their own manumission and not be "indebted to the Law." Such sentiments strengthened

TABLE 2
Barbados—Categorization Appeals, December 1, 1837–March 1, 1838

	Number of Appeals Accepted			Number of Appeals Rejected				
District	M	F	Total	M	F	Total	Remaining	Total
A-Town/Rural	17	21	38	6	3	9		47
B-Rural	16	33	49	7	6	13		62
C-Rural	30	47	77	17	23	40	13	130
D-Rural	8	28	36	8	4	12	6	54
E-Rural	22	46	68	29	22	51	40	159
F-Rural	5	18	23		4	4		27
G-Rural		6	6				6	12
TOTAL	98	199	297	67	62	129	65	491

SOURCE: "General Return of Appeals of Apprenticed Laborers Transferred from the *Praedial* to the Non-*Praedial* Class, December 1, 1837–March 1, 1838," Colonial Office Series 28/123, Folio 40, Appeals, National Archives, Kew, London.

once the legislation ending apprenticeship had been enacted. One stipendiary magistrate in St. Vincent reported that apprentices did not want to be "'a Queen Adelaide's Man,' that is free by the operation of the Law or as they say 'that Buckra may change his mind again and make the Apprenticeship longer.'"[35] In St. Vincent and probably elsewhere, apprentices had very clear ideas about freeing themselves. As in the period after emancipation in 1838 when there was a concern about reenslavement, there was also a fear at this point that the whites could lengthen the period of apprenticeship.

Masters and their apprentices also clashed over the classification system that determined whether an apprentice was a *praedial* (and therefore required to serve a six-year apprenticeship) or a non-*praedial* (a four-year apprenticeship). The legislation delineating the categories of apprenticeship was fairly complex, but what became clear almost immediately was the former owners' intent to classify many apprentices as *praedials* and therefore to have their services for the projected six years of the apprenticeship period. One stipendiary magistrate in Jamaica noted that many masters had categorized their apprentices without informing the apprentices themselves. The absence of significant checks on the planters meant that many apprentices might "be defrauded of their freedom, and be illegally detained in bondage until 1840."[36]

But as with the issue of compulsory manumission, many apprentices were aware of their rights and appealed against their categorization. The governor of Barbados reported in the spring of 1838 that there were a considerable number of apprentices in the process of challenging their categorization. The number of appeals on this issue reinforced the governor's view. As table 2 shows, between

December 1837 and March 1838 almost five hundred appeals of categorizations were filed in Barbados, and nearly three hundred of them succeeded. Going back to the summer of 1837, almost 570 of 877 appeals succeeded.

However, as with the abolition in 1834, apprentices knew that there was a campaign in Britain to bring apprenticeship to an end before its scheduled date. As agitation in Britain increased and some of the smaller islands of the eastern Caribbean began to legislate an early end to apprenticeship, some reports suggested that the system could not last. In the summer of 1838, a stipendiary magistrate in St. Vincent suggested that apprentices would undertake passive resistance if they had to continue as *praedials* after 1838.[37]

The abolitionist press in Britain—and particularly the *British Emancipator*—had far more ominous reports about potential trouble in 1838. It republished an article in a Jamaican newspaper threatening serious resistance; one black man reportedly said that "if all not free [in August 1838], the whole country will rise, and we will see what buckra and the mulatto can do with us, for we too much for them." The *Emancipator* also suggested that the *praedials* had never accepted the distinction between themselves and non-*praedials*, and that as a result, on August 1, 1838, "the entire class of field labourers will claim to be placed on a footing with their fellows, and . . . they will enforce those claims by adopting a system of passive resistance—by quietly, but with dogged determination, laying down their hoes and refusing to work any longer as slaves." Although the *Emancipator* discounted some of the language in these reports, it concluded that these views generally reflected the outlook of most of the apprentices.[38]

Apprenticeship ended completely on August 1, 1838, leaving formerly enslaved persons with the same legal rights as whites, including the right to vote, provided that they met the qualifications. Jamaica had imposed only minimal requirements for the franchise to allow all classes of whites to vote. The planters immediately sought to raise the requirements for the franchise after emancipation, fearing the consequences of an enfranchised black electorate. The Colonial Office in London repeatedly disallowed this legislation, however. Although the electorate was a tiny proportion of the population as a whole, blacks accounted for a sizable share of the voters.[39]

The Jamaican press highlighted concerns about the black electorate. Even the free colored press was worried about the power of the blacks: one such newspaper in the north of the island, the *Falmouth Post*, noted that the blacks had the power to return assemblymen who were "friends of the people" who would respond to the "unwashed constituency." It was clear that the planters were not alone in worrying about the vote of the ex-slave population.[40]

In the period following emancipation, many blacks helped to elect black and brown members of the House of Assembly. Assemblymen responded to this electorate. For example, one successful brown candidate for the assembly told an election meeting in his parish that the "whites had had their own way long enough and it was time to put them down." Another brown politician advertised himself as one of the "sons of Jamaica" and noted that natives should have a greater share in the running of the island. Similarly, the first black man in the House of Assembly in Jamaica, Edward Vickars, appealed to the black electorate with his slogan, "Vote for Vickars, the Black Man." Building on their response to apprenticeship, blacks after emancipation clearly had a significant political role, and many of them opposed the politics of the planter class.[41]

Blacks built on the gains they had made during apprenticeship and at the onset of full freedom. Although different from slavery, apprenticeship had sought to severely restrict the apprentices. Many apprentices therefore resisted the apprenticeship system at its outset and also sought to obtain manumission or reclassification to be released early from apprenticeship.[42] Because of the harshness of apprenticeship and the continued restrictions on free people at the moment of full freedom, many former slaves left the plantations and acquired land of their own. This meant that some of them could vote and could influence politics in ways that were very different from the politics of the planter class. This was also the case in Louisiana, where as Richard Follett has noted, "Former slaves wished to put freedom into practice by halting work, to attend political meetings, striking for higher wages, and walking off the job."[43] In the process of this politicization, former slaves began to see themselves as citizens.

NOTES

1. The most comprehensive treatment of apprenticeship remains W. L. Burn, *Emancipation and Apprenticeship in the British West Indies* (London: Cape, 1937). See also William A. Green, *British Slave Emancipation: The Sugar Colonies and the Great Experiment, 1830–1865* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1976); William A. Green, "The Apprenticeship in British Guiana, 1834–1838," *Caribbean Studies* 9 (1969): 44–66; Thomas C. Holt, *The Problem of Freedom: Race, Labor, and Politics in Jamaica and Britain, 1832–1938* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1992); Douglas Hall, "The Apprenticeship Period in Jamaica, 1834–1838," *Caribbean Quarterly* 3 (December 1953): 142–66; Swithin Wilmot, "Not 'Full Free': The Ex-Slaves and the Apprenticeship System in Jamaica, 1834–1838," *Jamaica Journal* 17 (1984): 2–10; W. K. Marshall, "Apprenticeship and Labour Relations in Four Windward Islands," in *Abolition and Its Aftermath: The Historical Context*, ed. David Richardson (London: Cass, 1985), 203–24; Demetrius L. Eudell, *The Political Languages of Emancipation in the British Caribbean and the U.S. South* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2002); Diana Paton, *No Bond*

but the Law: Punishment, Race, and Gender in Jamaican State Formation, 1780–1870 (Durham: Duke University Press, 2004). See also Natasha Lightfoot, *Troubling Freedom: Antigua and the Aftermath of British Emancipation* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2015), which deals with a plantation colony in the anglophone Caribbean that rejected apprenticeship.

2. Holt, *Problem of Freedom*, 56–57.

3. *Supplement to the Royal Gazette*, August 16–23, 1834, Proclamation: Sligo to the Newly Made Apprentices of Jamaica.

4. *British Parliamentary Papers* (hereafter *BPP*), 1835 (278-2), vol. 50, Nixon to Stanley, July 10, 1834, no. 198. See also Robert S. Shelton, "A Modified Crime: The Apprenticeship System in St. Kitts," *Slavery and Abolition* 16 (December 1995): 331–45.

5. *BPP*, MacGregor to Spring Rice, July 21, 1834, no. 200.

6. *Supplement to the Royal Gazette*, September 13–20, 1834; *BPP*, 1835 (278-1), 50, Smyth to Spring Rice, August 9, 1834, no. 113, Smyth to Spring Rice, October 12, 1834, no. 3.

7. *Postscript to the Royal Gazette*, August 2–9, 1834.

8. James Scott, *Domination and the Arts of Resistance: Hidden Transcripts* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990), xiii; Sligo to Glenelg, March 5, 1836, no. 362, encl. Murchison to Nunes, March 1, 1835, Colonial Office Series 137/215, National Archives, Kew, London (hereafter CO); *BPP*, 1836, (166-1), vol. 48, Sligo to Glenelg, April 2, 1836, encl. Report of E. D. Baynes, March 28, 1836, 343.

9. For an important collection on this theme, see Ira Berlin and Philip D. Morgan, eds., *The Slaves' Economy: Independent Production by Slaves in the Americas* (London: Cass, 1991).

10. *BPP*, 1838 (154-1), Part V, Jamaica, Stipendiary Magistrate Report, E. D. Baynes, July 1, 1837, 305.

11. Wilmot, "Not 'Full Free,'" 7

12. *BPP*, 1838 (154-1), Part V, Jamaica, Stipendiary Magistrate Report, Edmund B. Lyon, June 30, 1837, 300.

13. Ibid., Stipendiary Magistrate Report, J. W. Grant, July 12, 1837, 286.

14. Diary of Frederick White, Stipendiary Magistrate, in Jamaica, August 15, 1834, 27, Rhodes House, Oxford; ibid., August 18, 1834, 37.

15. Diary of Frederick White, August 18, 1834, 33, 36.

16. Ibid., 31.

17. *BPP*, 1835 (278-1), Part II, British Guiana, Smyth to Spring Rice, August 9, 1834, no. 114, 156.

18. Sligo to Spring Rice, October 12, 1834, Sligo Private Letterbook, Sligo Papers, MS 281, National Library of Jamaica.

19. Ibid.

20. *BPP*, 1835 (177), Part I, Jamaica, Examination of Mr. Towson, October 31, 1834, 51.

21. Ibid., Examination of Dr. James Maxwell, November 24, 1834, 100.

22. *BPP*, 1835 (278-1), Part II, Jamaica, 1833–35, Sligo to Glenelg, July 18, 1835, no. 143, 267.

23. Ibid., Sligo to Aberdeen, March 27, 1835, no. 38, encl. letter from W. Hewitt, Special Justice, March 24, 1835, 29.

24. Tyler to Macgregor, August 9, 1837, no. 71, Report of Pitman, Stipendiary Magistrate, July 3, 1837, Report of Polson, Stipendiary Magistrate, July 25, 1837, all in CO 260/55.

25. *BPP*, 1835 (177), Part I, Jamaica, 1833–35, Sligo to Spring Rice, December 9, 1834, no. 23, 63.

26. Sligo to Glenelg, February 8, 1836, Sligo Private Letterbook.

27. Sligo to Spring Rice, October 15, 1834, in ibid.

28. *BPP*, 1835 (278-I), Part II, Jamaica, 1833–35, Lyon to Sligo, July 1, 1835, 242.

29. MacGregor to Glenelg, June 12, 1837, no. 133, CO 28/119.

30. Anonymous to Spring Rice, October 1, 1834, CO 28/114.

31. *BPP*, 1838 (154-I), 1838, Part V, Jamaica, Abstract of the Return of Valuations, 89–90.

32. Ibid., Stipendiary Magistrate Report, W. A. Bell, July 2, 1837, 310.

33. Report of Polson, Stipendiary Magistrate, Second District, February 1838, Report of John Colthurst, Stipendiary Magistrate, Fifth District, March 31, 1838, both in CO 260/56.

34. MacGregor to Glenelg, March 20, 1838, no. 60, encl. Report of Henry Loving, Stipendiary Magistrate—Town District A—For February, CO 28/122.

35. Report of Polson, Stipendiary Magistrate, May 1838, Second District, CO 260/57.

36. Stipendiary Magistrate Report, E. D. Baynes, July 1, 1837, 306, in ibid.

37. Report of Polson, Stipendiary Magistrate, July 1838, Second District, CO 260/57, 301.

38. *British Emancipator*, April 11, 1838.

39. Gad J. Heuman, *Between Black and White: Race, Politics, and the Free Coloreds in Jamaica, 1792–1865* (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood, 1981), 119.

40. *Falmouth Post*, January 19, 1849.

41. Elgin to Stanley, December 23, 1845, no. 105, CO 138/285; *Falmouth Post*, July 24, 1849; "The Elections—The Franchise," *Jamaica Monthly Magazine* 1 (October 1844): 482–83.

42. For a useful discussion of apprentices (*patrocinados*) in Cuba also seeking freedom in the 1880s, see Rebecca J. Scott, "Defining the Boundaries of Freedom in the World of Cane: Cuba, Brazil, and Louisiana after Emancipation," *American Historical Review* 99, no. 1 (February 1994): 82.

43. Richard Follett, Sven Beckert, Peter Coclanis, and Barbara Hahn, *Plantation Kingdom: The American South and Its Global Commodities* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2016), 77.

Who Is Black in a Black Republic?

Labor in the Remaking of Black Citizenship in Liberia

CAREE A. BANTON

In 1865, in anticipation of a post–Civil War future in the United States, African American interest in Liberian emigration waned.[1] That year, the American Colonization Society (ACS) sent five migrant ships to Liberia. However, in keeping with the decline, the largest group of migrants on board these ships did not hail from the customary departure points on the American mainland. Instead, the ships brought new streams of migrants to Liberia: Barbadians from the Caribbean and African recaptives liberated from slave ships on the Atlantic Ocean.[2] Having united blacks from different points of origin, ships transformed Liberia into one of the most critical sites of African diasporic migratory assemblage in the nineteenth century.[3] As these groups joined native ethnic Liberians and African Americans in a black nation-building project, their migrations orchestrated changes in Liberia's demography while transforming the nation into a black cosmopolitan space. In altering Liberia's sociopolitical landscape, the new migrants created a milieu with multiple voices and visions. By bringing issues and demands different from those of African Americans, these migrants provoked intraracial disputes over matters of citizenship and belonging—specifically, which groups to embrace and the nature of their inclusion in the republic.[4]

Migration to Liberia originating from non-American spaces represents an understudied aspect of Liberian colonization. Barbadian and African recaptives' presence in Liberia contributed to redefinitions of black citizenship in a black republic. More specifically, labor intervened in historical efforts to define citizenship, reconstructing its meanings at a moment of crisis brought on by streams of new migrants. What forms of labor represented the new political subjects in Liberia? In what ways did labor map the sociopolitical divides in the imagined black community? How did migrants' labor serve Liberia's efforts to project an image of civilization and modernity?

Before the influx of the Barbadians and recaptives, little thought was given to their future citizenship status in the republic. Moreover, the presence of non-American migrants went against Liberia's founding ideals, since the ACS had imagined the nation-building project as solely for African Americans. The ACS's 1816 constitution had declared that the organization sought to "exclusively colonize free people of color residing in our country in Africa."[5] African Americans had dominated emigration to the republic, and citizenship was allocated almost exclusively to them. In its 1847 postindependence constitution, Liberia sought to clearly define the terms of citizenship, declaring that "none but Negroes or persons of Negro descent shall be eligible to citizenship in this Republic."[6] Through a black nationalist spirit of racial solidarity propagated in the diaspora, blacks were drawn into a sense of citizenship with the nation. But colonizationists' advertisement of Liberia as the Negro Republic, reflecting the essentialization and racism that created race, had overdetermined political claims for citizenship along racial lines.

Following the American Civil War, however, when the locus of Liberian migration shifted away from African Americans to African recaptives and West Indians, what it meant to be a black citizen in Liberia began to change in deliberate and meaningful ways. For a nation increasingly fixated on displaying civilization and modernity, the influx of Barbadians and recaptives unsettled ideas of an undifferentiated black racial identity. More significantly, for a black, race-conscious, and supposedly racially homogenous society, the new migrants also compelled new meanings of citizenship.

The constant struggles and contestations for citizenship have attracted rigorous analysis. Ideas of citizenship have often been grounded in nation, birthright, and blood. In the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, citizenship expanded and evolved. Voting, petitioning, access to civil rights, and participation in public life through the press increasingly formed the core of political citizenship. In fighting for independence from Spain, Afro-Cubans created a multiracial platform for citizenship that differed from the outcomes of similar circumstances in Mexico and the United States.[7] Similarly, in Brazil, enslaved Africans subverted traditional forms of citizenship through theatrical performances, seizing on the public sphere to act out and embody citizenship roles otherwise denied to them.[8] In recognizing their mutual universal rights, Colombians challenged normative forms of citizenship after emancipation.[9] Under an imperial structure, though racial inequality compromised experiences of citizenship for large numbers of black colonial subjects, they nonetheless participated in some semblance of citizenship through acts of petitioning.

African American migrants in Liberia have become the paradigm for understanding black transatlantic identity and variations in experiences of black citizenship.[10] However, in Liberia where race determined the question of citizenship for migrants, it is critical to outline the various ways articulations of such claims and the domains in which they emerged changed over time. The exclusion of other black migrants from Liberian colonization narratives flies in the face of evolving constructs of citizenship. Widening the scope of Liberian colonization to include other streams of black migrants expands citizenship constructs and reveals the paradox within ideas of blackness.

Indeed, the insertion of Barbadians and African recaptives into Liberian colonization narratives and their juxtaposition to their African American and native ethnic counterparts reveal the centrality of labor to a new discourse on citizenship and ideas of black civilization and modernity in Liberia. Discourse related to migrant labor formulated public expressions as well as policies regarding belonging and nonbelonging. Consequently, a double consciousness emerged in the Atlantic world through the different functions labor performed from place to place, thereby creating divergences in experiences of black citizenship.[11]

In the Caribbean and the United States, panic had arisen regarding the idea of preparing former slaves for citizenship. Enslaved Africans defined through their labor's centrality to racial slavery did not experience full self-ownership and were rendered powerless by legal policies and landlessness. Their exclusion from economic and political means to citizenship relegated them to a second-class status. This experience led blacks throughout the diaspora, especially black nationalists, to advocate for legal equality and assimilation or emigration as a way to defuse white supremacists' racist denial of citizenship to formerly enslaved blacks. Across the Atlantic in Liberia, however, the status of blacks reversed, as colonizationists and Liberian officials touted their labor as the signifier of civilization and modernity. In these instances of valorization, labor functioned as a condition for citizenship. Thus, paradoxically, even in Liberia, the vestiges of slavery continued to provide the background for citizenship claims through the ideas of race and productive labor. Colonizationists who were influenced by European scientists and philosophers reasoned that races evolved unevenly and the civilized should control the inferior. Europeans considered themselves the most civilized, followed by diasporic migrants reared in close proximity. To be considered civilized and modernized, black Liberian migrants needed to reclaim their racialization through slavery, recouping the necessary proximity to whiteness and concomitant white supremacist ideas. Diasporic experiences of enslavement became instrumental to the embodiment

of civilization, modernity, and productive labor, characteristics through which black migrants could attract Liberian citizenship.

Barbadian and recaptive African experiences of citizenship in Liberia stood in contrast to those of their African American counterparts. Whereas African American pioneers linked Liberia as a nationality to a certain ethnic orientation and cultural particularity, new migrants ushered Liberian citizenship into a political arena that went beyond narrow cultural affiliation. Thrust into the national spotlight, migrants viewed as "civilized" by virtue of their labor productivity not only redefined what it meant to be a black in a modern black republic but became an entirely new category of citizen. New forms of Liberian citizenship gave meaning through action. As Jurgen Habermas has outlined, "The nation of citizens does not derive its identity from some common ethnic and cultural properties, but rather from the praxis of citizens who actively exercise their civil rights."[12] The universal recognition of the utility of productive labor offered a different mode of incorporation into a republic unencumbered by ethnic identity. Discursive exchanges, missionary observations, government regulations and practices, and press stories came together to prescribe and affirm ideas of labor productivity as qualification for citizenship. Thus, discourses involving labor productivity redefined prior forms of Liberian citizenship and became a spectacle through which to exhibit the republic's modernity.

Prescribed ideas of citizenship established in the 1820s absorbed new streams of migrants arriving in Liberia in the mid-nineteenth century. On January 16, 1865, Nicholas Augustus, a blacksmith from the Caribbean island of St. Thomas who had "worked his passage to New York on the ship Theresa," traveled to Liberia on the *Greyhound*.[13] The following month, John Blyden, a steam engine boilermaker, noted for having "survived ten months as a fireman in the U.S. Navy," sailed from Boston to Liberia on the brig *M. A. Benson*.[14] He was the brother of Edward Blyden, Liberia's secretary of state. John Blyden and Nicholas Augustus were friends, hailing from the same Danish Caribbean Island. Having paid their way to New York, the ACS assisted with their voyage to Liberia. In a Liberian colonization movement previously dominated by African Americans, the migration of these two islanders was atypical. The plurality of identities represented by these migrants signaled the need to broaden Liberia's political association.

On June 3, 1865, seven emigrants left New York on the *Greyhound*. Among them were Daniel Walker from Carbondale, Pennsylvania, as well as Henry W. Johnson; his mixed-race wife, Patience; and their children from Canandaigua, New York.[15] Born in Vermont, Johnson had lived in Canandaigua for more than twenty years.[16] He had been a barber for many years, but according to the

ACS, "in face of obstacles such as would turn back a man of more ordinary perseverance, Mr. Johnson acquired a knowledge of law, and was admitted to practice in the Supreme Court of New York."[17] In the words of the ACS, "Mr. Johnson removed to Liberia, believing that in that field he can accomplish more for the political and social equality of his race than in America."[18] New African American migrants, especially the skilled and professional, were always welcome in Liberia. In August 1865, one settler wrote, "The lawyer Johnson of New York arrived with his family in the 'Thomas Pope.' The whole family seems very much pleased with Monrovia."[19] Johnson himself wrote, "After a pleasant voyage of thirty-six days; we arrived in Liberia."[20] Having to grapple with sickness and disease, migrants' expectations about life in Liberia did not always match their experiences on arrival. For African Americans, however, social acceptance was predetermined. As Johnson noted, "No incident happened during the journey, and we have been kindly treated by all the prominent citizens of Monrovia."[21]

African Americans also departed from other U.S. states. The passage of a series of laws in the 1860s led to the November 1865 emigration of 173 African Americans from Baltimore on the schooner *H. P. Russell*. The migrants left under the auspices of Virginia's Lynchburg Emigration Society, founded in 1825 as a chapter of the ACS.[22] The LES sought to aid and promote "the amelioration of the conditions of free persons of colour in the United States by resettling them in Liberia."[23] Mostly Baptists, the emigrants were "agriculturalists and mechanics of experience and business character."[24] Colonizationists described John McNuckles, the group's leader, as "a man of unusual shrewdness and practical good sense, a master plasterer and bricklayer, possessing the confidence and regard of the entire community in which he lived, and from which he removed to Africa."[25] The circumstances under which these emigrants departed highlighted their exclusion from American society. However, their practical skills forecasted their future status in Liberia.

In 1865, the largest group of migrants sent to Liberia under the auspices of the ACS departed from the Caribbean island of Barbados. Though the ACS had high hopes for the Barbadians, lingering doubts and an air of suspicion hung over them. In keeping with the larger goals of the Liberian project, the ACS inquired about the Barbadians' religious orientation, industriousness, manners, and civility. The society had prescribed a certain baseline black demeanor that included productive Christianity, civilization, and labor. Worried an official with the Massachusetts Colonization Society in a letter to William Coppinger, secretary and treasurer of the ACS, "I shall be rather sorry if the Barbadoes expedition fails, but we must not risk too much. You and the committee will be

able to judge whether it is safe. I have always had some doubts."[26] At an earlier meeting with the board of directors, members had declared that "the whole trip [would] cost . . . a hefty portion of a declining treasury."[27] The ACS could fund resettlement only for the "best" among the prospective Barbadian emigrants. The ACS thus tirelessly sought information about Barbadians from "merchants engaged in trade in Barbados as well as those who had visited the island."[28]

When the brig *Cora* sailed away from Barbados on April 6, 1865, transporting the 346 Barbadian emigrants to their new homes in Liberia, it undoubtedly set them on a path to a more expansive form of freedom and belonging. Historian Stephanie E. Smallwood has observed that the Atlantic passage was an "experience of motion without discernible direction or destination" for slaves.[29] With Barbadian emigration, however, the Atlantic opened possibilities for liberation, humanization, and citizenship. Caught between the burdens of the past and the promises of the future, the Barbadians' journey across the Atlantic must have been a transformational and moving experience. This passage likely filled them with the idea that they were on a direct course to achieving their postemancipation goals. These Barbadians found themselves traveling between two vastly different worlds: emancipated yet second-class citizens of the British Empire on one side of the Atlantic, fully free citizens of a black republic on the other.

The migrants had considered Liberia a space of social and political equality for those of the black race. Liberian officials had been equally enthusiastic, hailing the Barbadians' arrival "as highly auspicious for the future welfare of Liberia and the civilization of Africa."[30] The equality projected onto Liberia became tempered, however. The sense of racial harmony articulated by Barbadians and the Liberians proved problematic as migration across the Atlantic refocused their vision to experiences within the Liberian republic, where a persistent local ethnogenesis belied the rhetoric of black solidarity articulated throughout the diaspora. While awaiting the arrival of the migrants, President Daniel Warner announced, "My opinion of the Barbadians is that they will do well, and will prove as valuable an acquisition to the country as the same number of the American population that have come into it have done. On this question, there is amongst us a variety of opinion—some favoring the American side of the question; others the West Indian side."[31] For Warner, this moment of uncertainty signaled concern about migration's potential to cause national instability. It became apparent that a sense of presumed difference would figure into migrants' experiences of freedom and citizenship.

Liberia was not unlike other republics that had developed codes of citizenship impenetrable to some outsiders in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. When the ACS created the Liberian colony in 1822, African Americans were

designated as the only beneficiaries. In 1847, independence necessitated defining the terms of citizenship. In this new moment, African Americans creatively navigated their past and future to map out an idea of citizenship that signified their new identity as Liberians. African American migrants who became Liberian officials transformed terms implied within their broader pan-Africanist rhetoric into a nationally recognizable legislative language. They defined citizenship in Liberia by drawing on the ideals of the U.S. Constitution. As with the United States, citizenship in Liberia became an unmediated relationship between the individual and the state. All inhabitants in the area, whether politically represented or not, would have to accept the sovereignty of the Liberian state over their forms of government and acknowledge the laws of Liberia as binding.

African Americans also made citizenship in the republic dependent on race. Article 5, Section 13 of the Liberian Constitution declared, "The great object of forming these Colonies, being to provide a home for the dispersed and oppressed children of Africa, and to regenerate and enlighten this benighted continent, none but Negroes or persons of Negro descent shall be eligible to citizenship in this Republic."[32] The question of race and citizenship was directly related to African Americans' past difficulties with citizenship in the United States. This method of reading race into political questions of citizenship reflected another radical reinterpretation of republicanism, this time across the Atlantic.[33] In constructing the new political structure, African Americans ensured that state power would legally be in the hands of blacks. From the birth of the colony to the drafting of the constitution, the political sphere was coded African American. In the preamble to the 1847 constitution, African American experiences of slavery became a pretext that rationalized their leadership in the new political order. They laid claim to the republic by citing their suffering in the United States, where they were "shut out from all civil office" and "debarred by law from all the rights and privileges of men." They noted their inability to improve themselves under those conditions: "Against us, every avenue to improvement was effectually closed."[34] With this, African American migrants legitimized their citizenship in the republic. Along with the political foundations, the values and culture of the new nation would be tied to an African American identity.

African Americans' legal and political construction of Liberian citizenship destabilized the notion of a Liberian nationality held together by black homogeneity. Though Liberia was a black nation and constitutionally all blacks could be citizens, not all could make those claims. Though the racial aspect of Liberia's constitution reflected its architects' determination to establish models of racial equality based on laws that did not mandate racial discrimination, the

document masked other means of inequality and exclusion for some blacks. The insistence on a black national identity, while appearing inclusive in its definition of citizenship, was ambiguous and subject to interpretation. It both opened up possibilities for inclusion and placed boundaries on the ways that citizenship could be thought about, claimed, and exercised.

First, the indigenes had not disappeared with Liberian colonization. Indeed, a negotiation of differences between African Americans and the various ethnic groups indigenous to the area that became Liberia ran up against African American efforts to constitutionally define citizenship. Natives of the region held a collectivist sense of citizenship rooted in ethnic belonging. Ethnic groups from the Krus to the Mandinka viewed their place in Liberia through custom, heritage, and ancestry that united them to the land. Natives believed that they held by prescription and customary right the land on which they lived and buried their ancestors, and they illustrated their alternative idea of citizenship and belonging via repeated attacks on African American settlements.[35] But African Americans' formulation of citizenship excluded natives, who were viewed as uncivilized and unable to contribute meaningfully to the nation's future. By modeling the Liberian government after the U.S. government, African Americans aimed to subsume and subordinate native ethnic forms of belonging and citizenship to the overarching Liberian governmental structure, thereby nullifying native claims to power and authority in the area.[36]

The tension created by Liberians' affiliations with slavery added another layer of complexity to the question of citizenship, producing a coalitional ethos that acknowledged parallel but dissimilar forms of oppression. Asserted through the experiences of slavery in the Americas and slave trading in Africa, these differences created a disguised hostility that took the place of race as a signifier of intraracial difference. These differences became even starker with the presence of slave trading in areas inhabited by ethnic indigenes in the interior of Liberia such as the Gallinas located away from the Liberian capital, Monrovia, occupied by the diaspora. These two geographical spheres signified the ways in which the labors of slave trading contrasted with the labors of slavery and in which civilization and modernity from enslavement contrasted with the backwardness of slave trading.

Connections to slavery (as opposed to slave trading) created ideological boundaries around what it meant to be black and Liberian through methods not unlike those that emerged during the colonization of Africa. It produced citizenship by way of a black diasporic racial identity forged through proximity to whiteness and subjecthood and native identity through an association with slave trading and distance from whiteness.[37] Implicit in these distinctions was an

assumption of a dichotomy between the diaspora and Africa, with the Atlantic fragmenting meanings of race and blackness. Such ideas of black citizenship in Liberia correlated with one's ability to dissimulate "African-ness." Diasporic Africans presented themselves as demonstrating Africans' capacity to overcome backwardness and become civilized and modern. Native Liberians, however, could not discursively draw on rights in the same ways that African American men could. Natives had not participated in the American struggle that defined those rights and thus had no means of inserting themselves into the citizenship narrative to claim them.

Unlike the indigenes, Barbadians arrived in Liberia with enormous cultural capital that placed them on a path to citizenship. Even before their arrival, the ACS and Liberian officials had incorporated them into the nation based on their diasporic experiences of enslavement and suffering, perceived level of civilization, and pan-Africanist articulations. Liberian officials often referenced the Barbadians' thirty years of freedom and acknowledged their industriousness and their widely acclaimed religious character. In theory, the ACS's legal foundations and the cultural and political framing of the republic through the lens of the African American experience excluded Barbadians. However, Liberian officials' construction of citizenship and deliberations about the creation of a modern black republic while surrounded by "natives" created an additional loophole for Barbadian citizenship. As diasporic migrants who could carry out missionary work, Barbadians could earn citizenship by civilizing and Christianizing natives and drawing them closer to the ideals of a modern state.

Nevertheless, Barbadians' labor secured their citizenship status. As a consequence of their skillfulness, they were declared the "most important part of the whole sojourn for a nation desperate for a healthy and productive population."[38] Colonizationists as well as Liberian officials saw Barbadians as possessing the kinds of agricultural and artisanal skills and experiences that were imperative for the country's future development. President Warner affirmed the Barbadians' value by specifically pointing to their skills: "Among them were coopers, carpenters, shoemakers, a wheelwright, printer, and teachers, with several who thoroughly understood the cultivation of the cane and manufacture of sugar and the culture and preparation of all kinds of tropical products."[39] That a large proportion professed to be Christians further confirmed their pedigree and connections to their African American counterparts. As diasporic blacks, African Americans and Barbadians shared in Liberian citizenship through historical experiences and goals of self-improvement and civilizing natives. Officials thus concluded Barbadians, like African Americans, had come to Liberia "prompted by the love of souls as well as the desire to improve their temporal condition."[40]

Barbadians could claim de facto citizenship by joining in the African American narrative of the diaspora.

Barbadians' labor ranked chief among Liberia's national priorities, and citizenship became a forgone conclusion given the republic's need for productive labor. Government officials praised the ACS for selecting "the kind of materials required here for the up-building of this offspring of American and English philanthropy, and the further development of the country and the character of the people in it. . . . Your sagacity in selecting those materials, is due the very respectable and promising immigration with which we have just been favored." Officials noted that "the government of this Republic feels very grateful to the Society for the great interest it has taken in its West Indian emigration enterprise, both as it regards the pecuniary means it has furnished and the happy selection of the emigrants sent out."[41] The Liberian government viewed the skilled, educated, and professional Barbadian migrants as a first-class addition to the country.

The Liberian government extended citizenship to Barbadians as a consequence of the belief that they were important stakeholders in the republic's priorities. In 1865, one Liberian onlooker remarked that "the people just landed seem, upon the whole, to be a well-selected company, and may be regarded as a valuable acquisition to our young Republic." Former Liberian president J. J. Roberts described the new arrivals as "an interesting company. Most of the male adults, I am told are mechanics and practical farmers, and seem to have correct ideas about the circumstances and capabilities of the country—so far greatly pleased." Roberts reaffirmed Barbadian citizenship by repeating the well-worn argument that the Barbadians possessed the wherewithal for national development, specifically Liberia's need for "men here who thoroughly understand the cultivation of the canes and the manufacture of the sugar and indeed the culture and preparation of all kinds of tropical products."[42]

Land gave Barbadians a further stake in the nation and additional means of acquiring citizenship. The prospect of land on which to build homes, better themselves, and help forge a successful black nation played a significant and perhaps pivotal role in enticing Barbadians to Liberia. Shortly after arriving, Barbadian John Padmore, who had previously been a planter, noted that "the president has directed that our lands of twenty-five acres shall be laid off on Monday 16th on Carysburg road, which is the best locality for us." While working for wages had defined economic life and the relationship to the land in Barbados, Liberia reversed those dynamics, enabling Barbadians to fulfill their desire to build themselves up through their labor. In 1871, Padmore noted that "the young crops look promising. We have sold about fifty thousand pounds of

arrow-root and eight thousand pounds of ginger."[43] Linking their bodies and labor to the Liberian nation enabled Barbadian migrants to claim citizenship in more direct ways, allowing them to move from the discursive sphere of claiming citizenship to living it.

With national development at the fore, Barbadian immigrants were progressively drawn into a relationship with the land, other migrants, and the nation. As agriculturalists, Barbadians' work was often politicized and became representative sites for the staging of contestations over citizenship. Echoing American ideas of virtuous citizenship, Barbadian labor was further used for civic education. The *New Era* newspaper sought to visit all of Liberia's agricultural districts to evaluate their chances "for success in this department of industry." The publication's title highlighted the importance of labor and the new migrants to Liberia's renaissance. The newspaper campaigned to inform "the citizens of the several districts on the importance of educating their children and native boys, improving themselves, and sustaining their families by an economical and judicious system of farming." After a tour of the Barbadian settlement in Crozierville, the *New Era* reported, "This district is made up of small farmers. . . . Many of these people were first-class mechanics, some farmers, some teachers, and some small traders. The Barbadians are known to be the most intelligent and best-educated company of emigrants that ever came to Liberia, and equally industrious."[44] The exigencies of nation building and the larger civilizing project in making new demands on Barbadians' labor facilitated their citizenship. Missionary onlookers concurred, reporting that "the small farms of the Barbadians are cultivated with great care. They keep down all the grass and noxious weeds, and thus produce from one acre twice the amount of product that is made by other farmers that we have noticed."[45] Observers viewed Barbadians as good custodians of the land, a characteristic that demonstrated their fitness for citizenship.

Barbadians' agricultural labor was valued not only for national development but also for the vision of the nation that it projected. The image of civilized blacks diligently laboring on behalf of Liberian modernity thrust Barbadians to the forefront of the nation and into the gaze of observers, particularly white missionaries. With commentary often reflecting on Barbadians' institutions, industry, character, and infusion of their material cultures into Liberia, observers marked productive labor as the preserve of Barbadians. In 1867, an observant Episcopalian missionary hinted at the growing dialogue surrounding the Barbadian presence in Liberia: "Who in the world raises those fine yams why we never saw any like them for the many years we have been here?" "The Barbadians up the river," a companion responded, adding, "So too in Krootown,

maybe seen as good a tailor cutting and finishing as neat work as any man of the shears and needle ever made in any community. He too is a Barbadian!" Pointing to another of the Liberian newcomers, the friend continued, "Go to that man's brother's shoe-shop in Monrovia and see him make as neat and nice a shoe or boot as ever came from the hand or from the last of any of his trade. He is a Barbadian!"[46]

Moreover, Barbadians took advantage of Liberia's natural resources. According to the missionary, "Now and then we see beautiful pieces of furniture carried through our streets made of the unrivaled wood of the Liberian forests. These are made at Carysburg by a Barbadian, a first-rate cabinet maker [who] would shame a furniture warehouse in any city in the United States." Charles Inniss had been a cabinetmaker in Barbados, and a circular advertising his work in Liberia declared, "Charles Inniss: Cabinet Maker; Careysburg, near the residence of Mr. McDowell, all orders are entrusted to the care of the above named will be executed with neatness and dispatch and in the latest American and English style."[47] Such reports highlighted the connections between labor and citizenship.

In various ways, Barbadians' labor became a part of civic duty and efforts to cast the Liberian nation in a civilized light. With the civilized required to train the uncivilized, Barbadians were called on to take natives as apprentices, putting the migrants in a position similar to that held by the white plantocracy in the Caribbean. The Barbadians, however, seemed to approach this task with some reluctance. One Liberian observer, presumably from the United States, worried that "they have no native apprentice boys around them, except as by chance they hire them. I think in this they are unwise." Unaware of the motivations that had driven Barbadian emigration to Liberia, such observers reasoned that Barbadians "must get the good-will of the natives, and induce them to bind their sons till of age, that they may be taught to labor and educated to read and write, that both parties may be mutually benefited." Onlookers worried that without establishing a relationship with natives, Barbadians would fail to "accomplish much beyond a bare subsistence by such a system of one-horse power as they now have. Besides, they need implements of agriculture and machinery, and then with their industrious habits and promptness, they will be sure to succeed."[48] Although access to cheap native labor was an advantage of Liberian citizenship, the idea ran contrary to the Barbadians' definition of the term. For them, citizenship linked working the land and owning one's labor to having the independent source of wealth they desired.

In 1865, abolitionists' efforts to counteract the growing "second slavery" added to Liberia's pluralism and further complicated questions of belonging.[49]

British and American squadron ships patrolling the Atlantic routinely deposited Africans rescued from the slave trade onto Liberia's shores in the 1860s. One report from Liberia marveled at the rate at which recaptives poured into the republic: "Several years since there were nearly 5,000 Congoes rescued from slave ships by American men-of-war who were landed at Liberia." Unlike African American and West Indian emigrants, recaptives were not always welcomed. A Liberian official grimaced at "the alarming influx of savages landed from American cruisers in our midst within a few weeks or months." After lamenting the presence of these uncivilized persons, Liberian officials determined that the recaptives would have to be "civilized and [make] a profession of religion"[50] before they could be incorporated into the republic, and even then they remained "compromised subjects."[51]

The identification of recaptives as the Other at their point of entry into Liberia became one of several discursive exercises in black identity making, social stratification, and exclusive citizenship based on presumed differences. As much as ethnic identity generated differences, the Atlantic also become a force of distinction. Some recaptives in Liberia, many of whom hailed from West Central Africa, particularly Congo and Angola, had not crossed the Atlantic. Like natives, missing the experience of the Middle Passage and slavery excluded them from identifying with the diaspora and thus ensured their marginalization.

Decisions surrounding whether to include or exclude recaptives ushered in another period of crisis in Liberian citizenship. Unlike other groups, recaptives came to be viewed as a "migrant problem" and a category of people in need of regulatory legislation. The politics of patronage exercised over natives evolved into a form of paternalism regarding liberated Africans. Properly inculcating citizenship virtues among recaptives necessitated institutional arrangements and structures through which daily routines could be negotiated. As such, recaptives' relationship to the state would take the form of arranged housing and planned labor. To control recaptives, the Liberian government proposed a plan "to lay off a sufficient area of land at some suitable place in each county, say of several hundred acres of land each; to build one or more large suitable houses on them, and to settle the recaptives thereon, under good teachers, mechanics, and agriculturists, employed by and amenable to this government."[52]

Turning African recaptives into civilized free laborers fitting the image of modern blackness and eligibility for citizenship required multiple mechanisms, some persuasive and others coercive. According to government officials, "the recaptives may, on the manual labor system, have a definite number of hours schooling each day, and a definite number of hours to work each day, at the various branches of industry, agriculture being the principal; and for them to be

thus trained under the supervision of government, for their respective full terms of apprenticeship."[53] Through the apprenticeship system, recaptives were to be "bound out to reliable persons . . . after the expiration of the one year's support by the Society, fall on the hands of government to be supported and trained for terms of years, ranging from seven to fourteen years, according to the laws of this Republic regulating the apprenticeship of recaptured Africans."[54] Apprenticeship inculcated the habits of free laborers so that the recaptives could understand the duties of citizenship, rendering them useful not only to themselves but also to the republic.

The apprenticeship plan for recaptives went beyond economic efforts at social, religious, and political organization and training. By controlling recaptives' labor, Liberian officials attempted to maintain order and control access to citizenship through work. That many Liberian recaptives had not crossed the Atlantic created the perception that they lacked the necessary qualifications to move them from subjecthood to full citizenship. Like the indigenes, diasporic migrants regarded recaptives who had not crossed the Atlantic to experience extended interactions with whites as remaining in a state of suspended animation. The government thus despaired about finding individual masters or guardians for recaptives. If the recaptives could not find apprenticeships, the Liberian government noted, it "would be obliged, for its own safety as well as by the promptings of humanity, to take these people, thus un-provided for and turned loose upon the mercy of the public, under apprenticeship to herself, for the lawful term of their apprenticeship."[55] One report noted that "the Executive Committee will, no doubt, at once agree with this government, that those recaptives who may not be apprenticed out to individuals immediately on their being landed, they should, without a week's delay after being landed, be placed under the contemplated systematic and authoritative plan of training."[56]

To make matters worse, unlike African Americans and Barbadian immigrants who received parcels of land—the act of property ownership that presented them with certain rights—recaptives lacked access to land and thus were denied rights, privileges, and access to citizenship or inclusion in the republic. Instead of being small farmers, recaptives would be landless laborers at the mercy of fellow blacks. Like natives, recaptives became a part of a growing undercaste relegated to second-class status by laws regarding labor practices. Recaptives' dependence on African Americans and West Indians sanctioned their exclusion from forms of citizenship available to other black migrants. Further, the exclusion of some blacks from the republic occurred not solely through the usual rhetoric of race but instead through reassigned tropes of civilization and savagery determined by labor.

Diasporic migrants' control of labor organization in Liberia determined the nature of the structure and positions occupied by different groups of blacks. It was no coincidence that natives and recaptives served in coercive and restrictive labor practices that mirrored British postslavery efforts (outlined by Gad Heuman, this volume) and were akin to the systems of indenture, tenancy, and sharecropping that existed in the U.S. South after emancipation. The transfer of these kinds of labor arrangements to Liberia shaped experiences of freedom and citizenship. Running contrary to the ideas of liberty and free labor that had driven many migrants to Liberia, these systems showed the ways in which views about unfree labor persisted across space and became an exclusionary force in Liberia.[57] Many observers attributed this mode of exclusion to the migrants' American and European sensibilities.[58] In many ways, the exclusion also represented the revival of caste systems driven by ideas of labor, civilization, and modernity rooted in global white supremacist ideals, which Liberian elites retooled in their attempts to foster certain values, ideals, and attitudes that would make their modernity known to the world.

Beyond class status and education, labor added to the migrants' sense of place in the prefigured hierarchy within the Liberian republic that cultivated an unequal relationship between the different cohorts of blacks even before their arrival. This structure was largely scripted and shackled by the historical experiences of a white supremacist hierarchical order left intact after emancipation.[59] If Barbadians had entered Liberia as black subordinates at the bottom of the social ladder, then their claim to a stable middle-class identity would have been severely undermined. The presence of liberated Africans in Liberia shifted the focus away from Barbadians' low position in British society and their movement upward to a new advanced status in Liberia reflected in their settlement and views surrounding their labor.[60] Within this dynamic of defining black citizenship, migrants participated in the social reproduction of economic relations through labor that oppressed new categories of people. Within this reformulation, the centrality of Western and white supremacist notions of modernity and civilization to the notion of productive labor sustained the historical continuity of the relationship between slavery and citizenship. New ideas of citizenship thus preserved and proliferated hierarchies assumed to have been left behind.

African Americans and West Indians identified and strengthened their citizenship through their relationship to the Others they created by racializing themselves as blacks and native Liberians and liberated Africans as native ethnicities. The capacity to labor and the republic's ability to appropriate productive labor to projecting their modernity defined the savage and inferior identities placed on native ethnic Liberians and liberated Africans. West Indians and African Americans

could claim citizenship concessions gained through long-standing historical negotiations with white supremacist institutions and modes of operation, while dislocation from the arena in which both groups had negotiated the terms of Liberian citizenship barred ethnic Africans and liberated Africans from doing the same. By not allowing these Others to occupy the same citizenship spaces and by judging them according to a rubric of savagery, racialized natives and African recaptives provided a mirror through which African Americans and Barbadians articulated shifting perceptions of themselves as civilized and superior.

After emancipation, the construction of black citizenship based on labor and civilization structured new relationships of dominance among migrants in Liberia. A strong belief in the value of self-possession through one's labor united West Indians and African Americans in their contempt for other groups of blacks who served as hireling laborers—native Liberians and liberated Africans—as it further bred an egalitarian instinct that never accepted civilized black rule over other civilized blacks. In Liberia, it became permissible to discriminate against native ethnic Liberians and liberated Africans in ways that diasporic blacks had previously been victimized in Western societies. African ethnic identities replaced race as the criteria for new forms of discrimination. Old forms of discrimination that emerged in Liberia were made legal through governmental provisions. Natives, in their perceived primitive ways, and recaptives, having just been taken off slave ships, were seen as uncultured and a socially disruptive element for a Liberian society that sought to project black civilization and modernity under a constant white gaze. Liberia conformed to an image of order and modernity through the careful maintenance of the labor of different groups. Attitudes toward recaptives were thus also a response to the quest for a national image that would both be acceptable to whites and earn Liberia's acceptance into the family of nations.

The Liberian state justified and normalized capitalist exploitation through aspirations for racial development and modernity. While expanding the experience of citizenship for some groups, Liberia retreated from its full promises to others. Some groups were denied citizenship because they were "uncivilized." West Indians and African Americans with similar experiences of slavery and diaspora allied with each other based on a variety of ideological and socioreligious beliefs. These practices were often deployed to achieve hegemony over recaptives and indigenes, who had not gone through the full experiences of slavery, diaspora, and life in Western society.

Despite Liberia's constitutional sanctioning of exclusive black citizenship, migration alone proved inadequate to allow certain groups to fully make such claims. As various groups of blacks demonstrated their different impulses to-

ward citizenship, Liberia's connection to each group manifested in various ways, reverberating through the migrants' "labors" to credit or discredit their claims. Ethnic labels loomed large in the migrants' daily lives in various levels of social and political organization. The categorical distinctions between West Indians, African Americans, Natives, and African recaptives that emerged upon arrival represented a fundamental method of ordering Liberian society and structuring experiences of citizenship. As Jemima Pierre has similarly argued, differences between the different groups were conceived through ideas of labor and civilization and were consolidated through racialization, cultural discourse, legal practices, social conventions, and official and unofficial documents that often referred to the natives and liberated Africans pejoratively as "congoes" and "savages." Such ordering proved more than just the making subject to rule. As Pierre notes, "It was a distinction of ethnological proportions linking beliefs about the subjects' physiological, emotional, mental character," to exercise citizenship.[61] Under a white gaze and in fear of portraying an uncivilized front to whites, Liberia ultimately overrode the pan-African rhetoric that had drawn blacks into the republic and discursively extended citizenship to them.

NOTES

1. See David W. Blight and Brooks D. Simpson, *Union and Emancipation: Essays on Politics and Race in the Civil War Era* (Kent, Ohio: Kent State University Press, 1997); David W. Blight, *Race and Reunion: The Civil War in American Memory* (Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2001).

2. This essay uses *African recaptives* and *liberated Africans* interchangeably to mean those who were freed from slave ships on the Atlantic, sometimes along the African coast but also in and around the Caribbean.

3. *African Intelligencer*, July 1820.

4. Janis Ho, *Nation and Citizenship in the Twentieth-Century British Novel* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2015), 2.

5. *African Repository and Colonial Journal* 11 (1835): 288–89.

6. Frederick Starr, *Liberia: Description, History, Problems* (Chicago: n.p., 1913), 256.

7. See Ada Ferrer, *Insurgent Cuba: Race, Nation and Revolution, 1868–1898* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1999); Rebecca J. Scott, *Degrees of Freedom: Louisiana and Cuba after Slavery* (Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2005); Gary Gerstle, "Race and Nation in the United States, Mexico, and Cuba, 1880–1940," in *Nations and Nationalism in the New World*, ed. Don Doyle and Marco Pamplona (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2006).

8. See Celso Castillo, "Performing Abolitionism, Enacting Citizenship: The Social Construction of Political Rights in 1880s Recife, Brazil," *Hispanic American Historical Review* 93, no. 3 (August 2013): 377–410.

9. See Jason P. McGraw, *The Work of Recognition: Caribbean Colombia and the Postemancipation Struggle for Citizenship* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2014).

10. It is estimated that the ACS colonized more than 13,000 African American migrants to the republic, along with 346 Barbadians. See Tom W. Shick, *Emigrants to Liberia, an Alphabetical Listing* (Newark: Department of Anthropology, University of Delaware, 1971); Tom W. Shick, *Behold the Promised Land: A History of Afro-American Settler Society in Nineteenth-Century Liberia* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1980).

11. W. E. B. Du Bois coined the term *double consciousness* in *The Souls of Black Folk* (Chicago: McClurg, 1903). Paul Gilroy later expanded the phrase in *The Black Atlantic: Modernity and Double Consciousness* (London: Verso, 1993).

12. Quoted in Ho, *Nation and Citizenship*, 7.

13. *African Repository and Colonial Journal* 41 (1865): 35.

14. John Tracy to William McLain, September 26, 1864, Svend Holsoe Collection, Liberian Collections Project, University of Indiana, Bloomington.

15. Minutes of the Pennsylvania Colonization Society, May 8, 1865, Liberia Collections Project.

16. See Preston E. Pierce, *Liberian Dreams, West African Nightmare: The Life of Henry W. Johnson, Part Two* (Rochester, N.Y.: Office of the City Historian, 2005), 8.

17. *African Repository and Colonial Journal* 42 (1866): 35.

18. Ibid.

19. H. D. Brown to Alexander Crummell, August 20, 1865, Alexander Crummell Letters, Schomburg Center for Research in Black Culture, New York Public Library, New York.

20. "A Gifted Lawyer," *African Repository and Colonial Journal* 42 (1866): 39.

21. Ibid.

22. For more on the Virginians in the making of Liberia, see Marie Tyler-McGraw, *An African Republic: Black and White Virginians in the Making of Liberia* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2007).

23. *African Repository and Colonial Journal* 42 (1865): 35.

24. Ted Delaney and Phillip Wayne Rhodes, *Free Blacks of Lynchburg, Virginia, 1805–1865* (Lynchburg, Va.: Warwick House, 2001), 24.

25. *African Repository and Colonial Journal* 42 (1866): 35.

26. Joseph Tracy to William Coppinger, n.d., American Colonization Society Records, Reel 96, Domestic Letters No. 166, Folio 63563.

27. *African Repository and Colonial Journal* 42 (1866): 35.

28. Joseph Tracy to William Coppinger, n.d., American Colonization Society Records, Reel 96, Domestic Letters No. 166, Folio 63563.

29. Stephanie E. Smallwood, *Saltwater Slavery: A Middle Passage from Africa to American Diaspora* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2007), 122.

30. *African Repository and Colonial Journal* 42 (1866): 247.

31. Ibid., 38.

32. Starr, *Liberia*, 256.

33. Ibid.

34. Ibid.

35. See Hendrik Hartog, "Pigs and Positivism," *Wisconsin Law Review* 4 (1985): 899–935, section 3.

36. Elwood D. Dunn, Amos J. Bayan, and Carl Patrick Burrowes, *Historical Dictionary of Liberia*, 2nd ed. (Lanham, Md.: Scarecrow, 2001), 84–86.

37. See Mahmood Mamdani, *Citizen and Subject: Contemporary Africa and the Legacy of Late Colonialism* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996); Jemima Pierre, *The Predicament of Blackness: Postcolonial Ghana and the Politics of Race* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2013).

38. *African Repository and Colonial Journal* 42 (1865): 37.

39. Ibid., 47.

40. Ibid., 37.

41. Ibid.

42. Ibid.

43. Ibid., 45 (1871): 278.

44. *New Era*, January 17, 1878.

45. *African Repository and Colonial Journal* 42 (1865): 47.

46. Ibid., 43 (1867): 269. The bootmaker may have been Samuel Innis, who practiced that profession in Barbados.

47. Ibid.

48. Ibid.

49. For more on the "second slavery," the resurgence of the slave trade in the 1840s, and the campaign to abolish the Atlantic slave trade, see Javier Laviña and Michael Zeuske, eds., *The Second Slavery: Mass Slaveries and Modernities in the Americas and in the Atlantic Basin* (Zurich: Lit, 2014).

50. *African Repository and Colonial Journal* 42 (1865): 355.

51. Damani James Partridge, "We Were Dancing in the Club, Not on the Berlin Wall: Black Bodies, Street Bureaucrats, and Exclusionary Incorporation into the New Europe," *Cultural Anthropology* 23, no. 4 (2008): 660–87.

52. Ibid.

53. Ibid.

54. Ibid.

55. *African Repository and Colonial Journal* 36 (1860): 356.

56. Ibid.

57. For African American tenancy and sharecropping, see Donald Grubbs, *Cry from the Cotton: The Southern Tenant Farmers' Union and the New Deal* (Fayetteville: University of Arkansas Press, 2000).

58. M. B. Akpan, "Black Imperialism: Americo-Liberian Rule over the African Peoples of Liberia, 1841–1964," *Canadian Journal of African Studies* 1, no. 2 (1973): 217–36.

59. Tomas Almaguer, *Racial Fault Lines: The Historical Origins of White Supremacy in California* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994), 1.

60. Sandra Gunning, "Nancy Prince and the Politics of Mobility: Home and Diasporic (Mis)Identification," *American Quarterly* 53, no. 1 (March 2001): 44.

61. Pierre, *Predicament of Blackness*, 14.

PART 4

Race and the Public Sphere

This page intentionally left blank

Race and Belonging in the New American Nation

The Republican Roots of Black Abolitionism

PAUL J. POLGAR

In early January 1806, Peter Williams Jr., Methodist minister of a New York black church and a former pupil at the New York Manumission Society's African Free School, welcomed the new year by writing a letter to the American Convention of Abolition Societies beaming with grand expectations for the future of his fellow black Americans. Though persons of African descent had suffered for generations the "abject and forlorn condition" of slavery, Williams now believed history was witnessing "the African race emerging from complicated misery, to the full enjoyments of civilized life." Williams praised the "indefatigable zeal" of the abolition societies that, he explained, had made possible the freedom and equality of persons of color. The black minister understood the program of African American education and uplift advocated by antislavery activists as resulting in the "gradual discardment of the illiberal opinions" the majority of white Americans "entertained against part of the human family." Just over the horizon lay a promised land in which the United States would eliminate "all the distinctions between the inalienable rights of black men, and white," Williams boldly predicted.[1]

From the vantage point of free black antislavery activists in the early national U.S. North, the period of African American advancement that Williams described—and embodied—was no myth. The late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries witnessed the vast expansion of the free black population in the urban centers of Philadelphia and New York, the rapid development of African American communities and institutions, and the emergence of an economically successful and politically engaged black leadership group in the mid-Atlantic region. From this wellspring of African American betterment emerged a vision of antislavery reform based on an optimistic belief in black civic progress. In response to the bedrock contention of slavery's defenders that freed slaves were unsuited for freedom and posed a dire threat to the American body politic, early

national black activists cultivated a community of "republicans of color." Their virtuous conduct, moral behavior, and religious and educational attainments would affirm the ability of blacks to exercise their freedom responsibly and pave the way for the total abolition of slavery in the United States.[2]

Free black community leaders such as Richard Allen and Absalom Jones in Philadelphia and Peter Williams Jr., Henry Sipkins, and William Hamilton in New York set out to persuade the white public of blacks' capacity for republican virtue with a profound sense of a remarkable rise to republican respectability. The white-led Pennsylvania Abolition Society and New York Manumission Society shared a belief in black civil incorporation as central to antislavery agitation and worked with free black activists and institutions. This cross-racial abolitionist alliance furthered African American leaders' hopeful commitment to postrevolutionary republican values. These leaders sought civic inclusion in a republic to which these black activists were unswervingly committed.

The establishment of the American nation-state is often viewed as a racially exclusive process that foreclosed the ability of persons of color to realize meaningful freedom and equality. Between the emergence of a race-based delineation of the rights enshrined by the Declaration of Independence, the spread of slavery south and west, the political dominance of slaveholders, and the inexorable growth of northern white hostility to free blacks, the early national era (1783–1815) appears as a period filled with disappointment and failure for African Americans. Thus, for historians who have increasingly come to interpret the postrevolutionary period as one of halting black freedom and limited progress based on a white consensus of racial exclusion, the locus for black abolitionism must be found outside of the ideology of the American nation-state itself—in a nascent black nationalism, in a "radical counternarrative to the history of revolutionary republicanism," or in a "black print counterpublic," to name a few models of interpretation. Taking as its starting point black progress in the early national mid-Atlantic, this essay reconstructs free black abolitionism in postrevolutionary New York and Philadelphia. Demonstrating how black abolitionists drew on the republican dictates of the incipient United States to argue for an inclusive body politic of free black citizens, the essay argues that northern black activists believed that the cultivation of republicans of color offered the surest route to emancipation.[3]

While the strategy of promoting republicans of color attempted to shape the lives of individual African Americans, it was fundamentally intended to create a virtuous free black presence in the public sphere of the new United States and belie the slavery apologists' equally public claims of black incapacity for freedom. Over the past two decades, scholars have uncovered the vibrant

participation of African Americans in the young nation's public sphere. This essay extends this literature by revealing how free black northerners used the early republic's emphasis on the public sphere to fuse ideals of black citizenship with abolitionist reform.[4]

The revolutionary and early national eras brought sweeping changes to the status of slaves and free blacks in the mid-Atlantic. Legislatures passed gradual emancipation acts, liberalized manumission standards, and began to recognize the rights of free African Americans—as well as those of enslaved people in some cases. Pennsylvania's 1780 abolition law included a clause providing that everyone—white or black, slave or free—was now to be tried "in like manner" before the same courts of law.[5] The New Jersey legislature insisted that it was "desirous of extending the blessings of liberty" to the state's slaves and in 1788 enacted a measure giving blacks equal justice before the law. Moreover, in anticipation of the abolition of slavery, the legislature required that all masters teach slaves under the age of twenty-one how to read.[6] New York's Gradual Abolition Act of 1799 made no mention of the civic exclusion of African Americans, causing one free black to conclude that the state had "made the same provisions for the security of our rights as for the rights of others."[7] In 1809, New York granted those still in bondage the right to marry and own and transfer property.[8]

Thoroughgoing changes in the slave codes were matched by the explosive growth of the region's free black population. The aggregate number of free persons more than doubled from just under 18,000 in 1790 to 38,000 in 1810 and nearly doubling again by 1810, when it reached 68,804. By 1820, three-fourths of the mid-Atlantic's black population was free, whereas only thirty years earlier, six in ten blacks had been held in chattel bondage. Nowhere was this demographic earthquake more evident than in New York City and Philadelphia. On the eve of the American Revolution, only 300 free African Americans inhabited these two cities. By 1810, that number stood at 18,651. However gradual or compromised this liberty may have been, the position of a majority of African Americans in the mid-Atlantic states had shifted from slavery to freedom in a relatively short time.[9]

Most emancipated bondspersons were grouped at the bottom of New York City's and Philadelphia's economy, marginalized both socially and economically. But this sobering picture of black emancipation tells only half the tale. Many freed African Americans in the urban mid-Atlantic experienced economic progress and personal empowerment. By 1816, about 20 percent of Philadelphia's free blacks had established themselves in proprietary, professional, or artisan employment, and 11 percent ran their own businesses. Some industrious free blacks saved money and bought real estate, an act that brought them from

being claimed as property in slavery to owning property in freedom. As many as one in three of New York City's free black male heads of household were artisans, professions lionized in the early national era as the bulwark of an independent citizenry. All of these economically self-sufficient free blacks achieved a degree of autonomy unimaginable in slavery. And from among this group of socioeconomically successful free blacks who had achieved respectability and exuded a confidence and optimism about what was to come emerged an abolitionist program premised on the mores of American republicanism.[10]

Northern emancipation made possible the meteoric rise of a set of accomplished individuals. Their stories manifest the sense of progress and optimism felt by African American community leaders in Philadelphia and New York and capture many of the major influences of black antislavery activism. One of these leaders was Richard Allen. Born into slavery in Delaware in 1760, Allen converted to Methodism and convinced his owner to allow him to purchase his freedom. Allen then began a new life as an itinerant preacher, starting in Delaware before moving on to New Jersey and then Pennsylvania. Everywhere he went, Allen preached the Gospel, made converts, and encouraged his audiences to live sober, industrious, and moral lives—in other words, to be godly.[11]

One of the most extraordinary elements of Allen's early career is the number of positive interracial experiences he had while serving as a peripatetic missionary. Allen referred to influential apostle Benjamin Abbott as "a friend and a father." Allen bought the land on which he built the first independent Methodist black church in the United States from the "kind and affectionate" Jonathan Bunn of Bennington, New Jersey. And Bishop Francis Asbury noticed Allen's talents and served as the young black preacher's spiritual mentor. Even though white Methodists moved away from their antislavery stance and biracial beginnings by the early 1800s, Allen's understanding of black uplift and abolitionist reform originated in his belief that white people could be convinced of the humanity of persons of color. After all, Allen himself offered living proof of such an assumption.[12]

Allen settled down in Philadelphia, founded a chimney sweeping business, purchased property, and gathered a growing body of black Methodists. He also met another African American on the rise, Absalom Jones. Fourteen years Allen's senior, Jones had been born a slave in Sussex, Delaware, in 1746. Even in bondage, Jones committed himself to a life of individual progress. Four years after arriving in Philadelphia in 1762, he received his master's permission to attend a night school, where he learned mathematics. In 1770, Jones married a slave and convinced her owner to let him buy her freedom. Jones took on extra work whenever he could and raised money from local Quakers, enabling him

to purchase his wife's liberty. By 1778, still enslaved, Jones bought a house and, aware that it could be seized "as the property of my master," pressed for his freedom. In 1784, his master finally granted Jones's request. Hard work and disciplined saving had taken Jones from subjugated slave to property-owning freeman in a little over two decades. His life embodied the perfect model of what "industry, frugality, and economy"—central republican virtues—could yield to Philadelphia's growing free black population. Jones and Allen teamed up in religious, reform, and antislavery projects, always remaining cognizant of their firsthand acquaintance with the power of republican principles.[13]

New York City, too, had its share of distinguished free blacks. One of the most illustrious was Peter Williams Jr. His father and namesake had gained his freedom and gone on to become a prominent tobacconist and one of the wealthiest black New Yorkers of the late eighteenth century. He also was an ardent supporter of the American Revolution. Peter Williams Jr. inherited his father's identity as a patriotic citizen. Born around 1780, the younger Williams later recalled that his father had instilled "an ardent love for the American government" that "made me feel . . . that it was my greatest glory to be an American."[14] Williams attended the New York Manumission Society's African Free School and later became the first ordained black Episcopal minister in New York City. He paired his learning with a commitment to abolitionism and black uplift. In the early national era, Williams helped to found black reform organizations, delivered antislavery speeches, and wrote editorials on behalf of New York's African Americans.[15]

Among those who joined Williams in the free black leadership vanguard were William Hamilton, a house carpenter and frequent orator; Henry Sipkins, the son of the founder of New York's second black Methodist Church; William Miller, a Methodist minister; and black educator John Teasman. All of these men were patriotic, respectable, successful, confident, and optimistic about what was to come, and they became pillars of Philadelphia's and New York's communities of color.[16]

Building on their newfound agency, free blacks in New York City and Philadelphia cultivated community associations that acted as institutional strongholds for the rising generation. Within these cultural centers an ideology of antislavery reform and black uplift started to take shape. In addition to carving out their own churches, free blacks established mutual aid societies that supplied much-needed support for a community of persons recently liberated from slavery. Two of the earliest and most extensive of the aid societies were Philadelphia's Free African Society and the New York African Society for Mutual Relief. The Free African Society, founded in 1787, primarily by Allen and

Jones, and the New York African Society, formed in 1808 and whose charter members included the younger Williams, Sipkins, and Hamilton, had purposes that were both benevolent and moral: benevolent in that they created communal funds from which members could draw in times of distress and moral in that the groups demanded a strict code of behavior from their members.[17]

The free blacks who launched independent churches and mutual aid societies were not solely concerned with creating and sustaining a community. They had bigger aspirations. From their citadels of communal cohesion, African Americans built a program of antislavery reform premised on the belief that an evolving cadre of black civic actors could play a preeminent role in abolishing American slavery. This unwavering commitment to republicanism drove New York City and Philadelphia free black antislavery activists. For these reformers, resting their abolitionist activism on republican ideology made complete sense given that the revolution had enabled black liberty and free African American community development.

These African American abolitionists looked to the ideals of the republic in which they lived to assist them in delivering their brethren from the house of bondage. They believed that the revolution's promises of freedom and equality were embedded in American republicanism, forming the basis of the new nation's identity and its governing creed. In a speech observing the abolition of the international slave trade in 1808, Williams called the revolution that "illustrious moment" when a "sacred temple of liberty" was erected according to the precepts that "all men are created equal." In the wake of American independence, the "angel of humanity" had brought the "bleeding African" into the civil fold by claiming the "inherent rights of man" for people of all colors.[18]

In a eulogy of George Washington, whom Americans saw as the embodiment of virtuous republicanism, Allen exclaimed that the nation's progenitor was a "sympathizing friend and tender father" to America's blacks who "believed we had a right to liberty." Allen marked Washington's passing as an event in which Philadelphia's people of color "participate in common with whites" and pressed his congregation to "shew to the world that you hold dear the name of George Washington." The mid-Atlantic's black abolitionists viewed the creation of the United States and the spread of African American emancipation and racial uplift as resulting from simultaneous forces indelibly linked by the principles of freedom and equality.[19]

American republicanism emphasized not only the liberties but also the duties incumbent on members of the body politic. Black abolitionists tapped into American republicanism's preoccupation with a virtuous citizenry and invoked it as the proving ground for African American freedom. Free black community

leaders and antislavery activists used public gatherings to disseminate republican values among their black brethren. Sipkins called for "an upright and steady deportment" among the emancipated, while Williams counseled free people to show "a strict obedience and respect to the laws of the land."[20]

To ensure black civil cultivation, Henry Johnson, a black freeholder in New York City, warned his "fellow-citizens" to be vigilant against immoral and depraved behavior, insisting that there were no "greater advocates" for African American freedom than free blacks.[21] Allen wanted persons of color to adopt the entreaty of Washington's farewell address to "love your country—to obey its laws."[22] Jones advocated both republican simplicity and austerity, calling on African Americans to be "sober-minded . . . temperate in our meats and drinks, frugal in our apparel and in the furniture of our houses" and "industrious in our occupations," so as to "furnish no cause of regret" among white Americans about the merits of black freedom. To secure the progressive march of emancipation, black abolitionists were sculpting a community of republicans of color.[23]

In fashioning themselves model republicans, black abolitionists went beyond adopting the behavioral precepts of the American polity to assert their capacity for virtuous citizenship through active political engagement. Many black New Yorkers supported the Federalists. In 1809, Joseph Sidney, a leading black Federalist, announced that emancipation "has broken down the wall of separation that had previously distinguished our rights and duties from those of the white inhabitants." This "assimilated" state of black rights, according to Sidney, carried with it the "indispensable *duty*" of suffrage. Noting wryly that the "great idol of democracy," Thomas Jefferson, and his fellow Virginia Republicans were the same people who held "our African brethren" in a state of slavery, Sidney argued that black electors' choice between Republicans and Federalists was one between "your enemies and your friends" and between "slavery and freedom."[24]

Well aware of pro-slavery assertions of black inferiority, African American abolitionists consistently highlighted the need for their compatriots to counter the indictments of slavery's defenders. Sidney pushed blacks to demonstrate "that sobriety, honesty, and industry are the distinguishing traits of our character." Were persons of color to "unceasingly" guide their actions by "pure and upright conduct," they would "effectually put to silence every cavil which may be offered against African emancipation, and must eventually convert our enemies into friends."[25] Johnson challenged the emancipated to "improve and prove ourselves worthy of all the privileges" of liberty. Through the adoption of the "habits of industry, frugality, and honesty," free persons could put themselves on "the sure road to happiness, respectability and prosperity."[26] George

Lawrence believed that blacks could play their part in bringing about abolition by "abounding in good works, and causing our examples to shine forth as the sun at noon day." This course of action would "melt" the "callous hearts" of slavery's defenders "and render sinewless the arm of sore oppression."[27] By becoming republicans of color, free blacks strove to "form an invulnerable bulwark against the shafts of malice," at once raising their station in freedom and exploding the fallacious accusations of slavery's proponents.[28]

Even as they railed against those who discounted the ability of the emancipated to responsibly exercise their liberty, black abolitionists granted that slavery made many bondspersons less than desirable candidates for membership in civil society. But the source of the problem was slavery, not race. Johnson commented that it was perfectly understandable for slaves, the mere "property of others," to disregard the "propriety of conduct, habits of industry, or precepts of morality." Slavery represented a "hopeless situation" where the enslaved were "lost in a sense of wretchedness," their "natural strengths" going "uncultivated."[29] Another African American antislavery orator observed that slavery "keeps down all the noble faculties of the soul, debases and corrupts human nature, and reduces man to a mere instrument."[30]

The institutions of an emerging community would therefore play a crucial role in elevating blacks degraded by slavery. The many black churches, relief societies, and educational outlets spreading throughout early national New York City and Philadelphia meant that "the thick fogs of ignorance" that had for so long shrouded African Americans were "gradually vanishing . . . dissipated by the superior radiance of increasing knowledge."[31] Thousands of former slaves were "emerging from the depth of obscurity" to the echelons of enlightenment, making black activists certain that "we may anticipate a pleasing reform in the manners of many of our brethren."[32] This essentially environmentalist approach to human behavior and social development girded black abolitionists for the long fight ahead and underscored the idea that the newly liberated had to transform their former ignoble existence in slavery into a virtuous, ennobled life of freedom.[33]

In their resolute identification with environmentalism and republican virtue, black abolitionists embraced the values of the wider antislavery movement. White and black antislavery reformers shared an ideological road map to abolition and in several instances worked together to achieve their emancipatory vision. The New York Manumission Society and Philadelphia's Pennsylvania Abolition Society, in conjunction with free black leaders in both cities, assembled their vocabularies of reform from the same assumptions. The two groups focused much of their activism on the need to convince the white public that black

Americans were capable of a virtuous, republican exercise of their freedom. White abolitionists reminded free persons of color that "one great obstacle to [emancipation] it is in your power and it is eminently your duty to remove; the enemies of your liberty have loudly and constantly asserted that you are not qualified to enjoy it."[34] Only by rejecting "idleness, gambling and dissipation" and embracing "industry," "morality," "education," "temperance," and "virtue"—and in turn making themselves "good and useful citizens" of the republic—could free blacks help emancipation win out.[35]

Black abolitionists could not have agreed more. The free black leaders of Philadelphia and New York dispensed nearly identical advice to their communities of color, cautioning them against being "lazy and idle" and warning that "base pursuits, habits of idleness, and unguarded insolence" would "reduce us to misery . . . and be a stumbling block" to those who "remain in bondage."[36] Allen used the sensational murder of a white woman by two Philadelphia blacks to issue a jeremiad beseeching free persons of color to "never more attend a frolic"; to give up drunkenness, swearing, and whoremongering; and to correct their intemperate behavior by attending church regularly.[37] Black abolitionists exhorted free African Americans to "walk worthy of our profession wherein we are called" and to "free our minds from every trace of that ignominious state" of slavery through "virtue and education," which would show beyond the shadow of a doubt that the emancipated were "not only capable of self-government, but also of becoming honourable citizens and useful members of society."[38] The leaders of these growing free black communities had already exemplified the civic ideal of republicans of color, wholeheartedly committing them to the program of African American uplift.

By founding free black schools, urging persons of color to comport themselves virtuously, and publicizing instances of African American achievement, white abolitionists relied heavily on environmentalism. Black antislavery activists likewise articulated a thoroughgoing environmentalism in their antislavery efforts. Allen and Jones defended the actions of black volunteers during Philadelphia's 1793 yellow fever crisis, telling slaveholders, "If you would try the experiment of taking a few black children, and cultivate their minds with the same care . . . as you would your own children, you would find upon the trial, they were not inferior in mental endowments."[39] In rejecting the claim that "Africans are inferior to white men in the structure of body and mind," William Hamilton, the first president of the New York African Society for Mutual Relief, announced in 1809 that "science has begun to bud with our race." Holding up examples of black literary accomplishment, including the antislavery orations of Williams and Sipkins, Hamilton confidently proclaimed, "Soon shall

that contumelious assertion be proved false, to wit, that Africans do not possess minds as ingenious as other men."[40]

Reflecting their mutual embrace of the philosophy of antislavery reform, black and white abolitionists also joined forces in the struggle to complete the destruction of slavery. In April 1790, five delegates of the Pennsylvania Abolition Society met with leaders of the Free African Society, familiarizing its members with the Pennsylvania Society's efforts to improve the condition of free blacks. The Pennsylvania Abolition Society's emissaries asked the Free African Society to help them collect information on the state of black Philadelphians, a request with which the Free African Society eagerly complied.[41] Further advancing this objective, two decades later Philadelphia's free black activists founded the Society for Suppressing Vice and Immorality. Members of the society planned to visit the homes of freepersons and, through "persuasive measures," hoped to "produce a reformation of manners" among the newly emancipated.[42] When the Society of Free People of Colour for Education of Children of African Descent started up a school for free blacks with the purpose of making them "useful members of society," they invited the superintendents of the Pennsylvania Abolition Society to measure the "progress of the pupils" and give curricular advice.[43]

New York City's black activists also identified with white abolitionists. In 1796, the New York Manumission Society welcomed a group of free blacks who asked for the society's "advice and assistance" in forming "an association" that would root out "every species of vice among the people of their own description, by information, advice, and above all by an example of virtuous conduct." The society approved of the "worthy design" of these free black reformers and offered assistance.[44] The Manumission Society also helped to gain a state charter for the New York African Society for Mutual Relief in 1810, causing the latter group's vice president to remind its members that in the "great work of extending your liberties, the manumission powers were very active."[45] Commemorating the second anniversary of the abolition of the Atlantic slave trade, a committee of free blacks planned to donate part of the proceeds from their jubilee to the New York Manumission Society.[46] At least one black antislavery oration was printed by a member of the Manumission Society, who then placed advertisements promoting the publication in New York City newspapers. The presence of white abolitionist allies was absolutely crucial in convincing black leaders that their race had a future in America.[47]

And that future, black abolitionists believed, was a bright one. The ultimate reflection of free black antislavery optimism may be found in orations against the slave trade delivered between 1808 and 1815. Long viewed as the most egre-

gious violation of human rights associated with the institution of chattel bondage, the international slave trade was outlawed by the U.S. Congress in 1808. Antislavery activists on both sides of the Atlantic considered it a monumental achievement that would lead irrevocably to the disintegration of institutional slavery. The ban garnered a bevy of communal gatherings by black northerners to celebrate what they marked as an auspicious day for African American freedom. In New York and Philadelphia, African American activists subsequently delivered yearly orations that laid out narratives of their enslavement and transition to freedom, fostered a free black identity, and proffered a formula for completely abolishing American slavery. Subsequently printed and distributed for public consumption, these orations were a uniquely African American literary genre, and as such, they quickly attained a conventional quality.[48]

Nearly every address began by portraying the abolition of the international slave trade as the conspicuous harbinger of an ever-growing black freedom. Sidney thought the ban on the Atlantic slave trade a big "stride" in the direction of "the total abolition of slavery in America" and "a progress towards the consummation of our fondest hopes" that forecast that the antislavery movement would "finally triumph!"[49] Adam Carman told his black listeners to "rejoice at the event, and never forget the highly favorable and encouraging laws now provided for our welfare."[50] Lawrence delighted in his confidence that the abolition of the slave trade constituted a "heaven born plant" that "shall bring forth the full fruits of emancipation, and divulge the bright genius so long smothered in slavery."[51] Sipkins declared that the abolition of the slave trade "will ere long become the unanimous voice of the world."[52] Russell Parrott's effusiveness knew no national boundaries, couching the slave trade's cessation as the "commencement of that happy era, in which Freedom shall reign to the 'furthest verge of the green earth.'"[53] The orators impressed on their fellow blacks the massive importance of the slave trade's abolition and communicated to them the efficacious results it foretold.

After this rosy introduction, the orators invariably narrated a history of African enslavement. They set in diametrical opposition a history of European vice and greed-stricken depravity that brought about New World slavery and a primordial African nobility and virtue that had fallen victim to rapacious slave traders. Prior to European arrival, Africa had been filled with "simplicity, innocence, and contentment," its "blissful regions" and "innocent inhabitants" a product of the "beneficent hand of nature."[54] "Rich in the enjoyments of liberty and all the glory nature could afford," Africans had made their continent a site of "Liberty, Peace and Equality."[55] Then came the Europeans: "harmless Africans" were "easy prey to European wiles."[56] After initially realizing that Africans

possessed rights and liberties "inherent in them," Europeans came to view the enslavement of blacks as "a matter of right."[57] Slave traders instilled "a spirit of avarice, and love of luxury" in all those they encountered, making the once "paradisical garden" of the African continent "groan from sea line to its center."[58] The romanticized idea that Africa's Edenic serenity had been despoiled by calculating Europeans had been invented by white antislavery writers, who produced widely circulated tracts with which black activists were clearly familiar. Black orators then added their own twist to this well-established antislavery literary convention.[59]

From the corruption of Africa, black abolitionists asked their audiences to imagine the terror and sadness that the transformation from freedom to slavery must have stamped on its "wretched victims." The orators described parents and children, brothers and sisters separated forever as they were "torn from their native land" and placed on slave-trading vessels.[60] Next, the Middle Passage was colored by the "dejected countenances" of the enslaved and marked by their "streaming eyes" and "fettered limbs."[61] The speakers envisaged the "piercing cries" and "pitiful moans" these poor men and women surely let forth. When they arrived in the New World, their painful subjugation continued.[62] Mere "vendible articles," the enslaved were "viewed and considered as commercial commodities."[63] Doomed to "the lash, extreme hunger, and incessant hard labour" of plantation life, slaves could look forward only to the "emancipating grave" as a final respite from their mortal torture.[64]

Black orators used this dire delineation of African enslavement as an elaborate setup to accentuate the impressive progress of black Americans. Where "sophistry, falsehood, cruelty, and tyranny" had held sway, now, "in these United States, reason, truth, humanity, and freedom have finally obtained a glorious triumph."[65] Where human bondage had gone on unchecked, the abolition of the slave trade had brought about the "dying away" of "the sources of slavery," and the "condition" of African Americans was "fast ameliorating."[66] Since the "hydra from which issued all our sufferings, has received its death wound," the time was close at hand when "the rich fruits of liberty shall be strewed in the paths of every African and descendant."[67] The northern states were "fast conceding" black liberty, and the southern states "must comply."[68] Parrott reminded free persons of color that "our present situation, contrasted with" what it was before the Age of Emancipations and the abolition of the slave trade, "presents a picture highly animating to the humane mind," and he averred that "under the mild influence of the laws of Pennsylvania, *we* are rapidly advancing in every useful improvement."[69] Making clear that "very different are the days that we see from those that our ancestors did," black abo-

litionists tried to imbue the members of their communities with a strong sense that the tide of history was on the side of the formerly oppressed.[70]

Black New Yorkers and Philadelphians did not see African and American identities as mutually exclusive. Making creative use of the traditional antislavery rhetoric of Africa's original virtue, these black orators characterized Africa as a site of black righteousness that persons of color needed to recapture as they made the switch from slavery to virtuous citizenship. Just as Africans found relief from the privations of the slave trade and reembraced their pure, idyllic past—"emerging from the depths of darkness and despair" to "the most brilliant rays of future prosperity"—so, too, would freed slaves reconnect with their prior African glory and natural morality, the "day star" of freedom "dispersing the dark clouds" that had covered African Americans in slavery.[71] While the orators unambiguously identified with Africa and its people, this black antislavery discourse looked decidedly to the American republic rather than to Africa as the final destination of the newly emancipated. In this way, the orators were not proto–black nationalists. Nor at this juncture did they think that relocating to Africa would solve the problem of American slavery.[72]

Despite celebrating the many advances of persons of color, the slave trade orators ended their speeches by confronting the one imposing barrier that stood in the way of emancipation: white prejudice. Sipkins, among others, blamed the "strong imbibed opinion of our [black] inferiority" for still "shed[ding] on the mind[s]" of many white Americans "its wizard darkness."[73] Nursed by those whites who "ungenerously denounce us vagrants, indolent and beastly rioters, mere nuisances in society," and buffeted by the "unmerited reproach" of "those perfidious men" who "brand us an inferior species of human beings," prejudice presented the "most insuperable difficulties" to finalizing the project of black freedom.[74] In this area, listeners could make all the difference. If the newly emancipated would "cling closely to the paths of virtue and morality" and avail themselves of opportunities for education, they would "give an effectual blow" to slavery's defenders.[75] Free blacks were standing on the grand stage of abolitionism and had the power to act as a powerful antidote to all those whites skeptical of emancipation's feasibility. These black abolitionists believed that the movement to abolish slavery would either stand or fall primarily on the relentless strivings of the already emancipated to live up to their equal potential as republican citizens.

Maybe these reformers were too sanguine in thinking that a virtuous community of republicans of color could break apart American slavery. To a knowledgeable, successful, and upwardly mobile leadership class of mid-Atlantic free blacks, however, an optimistic faith in this strategy emerged organically from

the group's own accomplishments and hopes for the future of black Americans. Moreover, these activists believed that the state itself constituted a powerful mechanism buttressing their reform program. Thus, when Teasman was selected in 1811 to deliver the keynote speech on the second anniversary of the New York African Society's state charter, he depicted the organization's incorporation as indicative of a larger trend toward black liberty and citizenship in the state. The New York government had "arose, decreed, and stretched forth its arm for the destruction of slavery in itself." Then, following the passage of a gradual emancipation law, the state took free blacks "into social citizenship, gave you a charter, placed you on a level with other civil societies of the state, and rendered you a body politic," announced Teasman.[76] Black community leaders interpreted their liberty and success as part and parcel of the same revolutionary forces that propelled early national American society. Thus, from the perspective of these men, fixing on republican ideology as the cornerstone of abolitionist agitation constituted a wholly reasonable calculation.

Yet this antislavery strategy had some serious drawbacks. One issue was the question of reception. There were no signs of class antagonism among free blacks in either early national Philadelphia or New York City. Nevertheless, the continual infusions of emancipated blacks and runaway slaves into the urban mid-Atlantic may have contributed to a clash of sorts between the established black middle class and the many African Americans stuck on the bottom rung of the socioeconomic ladder. Removed economically and perhaps culturally from the black leadership class, impoverished blacks were overburdened with trying to scrape out a living. They may have declined or simply lacked the time to devote themselves to the austere demands of republican cultivation that the black middle class championed so enthusiastically.[77]

A more damaging dilemma was what Patrick Rael has called the problem of representation.[78] For every virtuous free black displaying his aptitude for the strictures of republican citizenship, many whites pointed to others among the emancipated who failed to live up to the benchmarks of civic propriety. As cities grew and industry developed, class distinctions became more visible among blacks. African American abolitionists bemoaned that many whites dismissed free black accomplishments by condemning the growing impoverished urban underclass. Indeed, by the second decade of the nineteenth century, black and white activists alike had become acutely aware of the apparent staying power of white prejudice. While black activists increasingly came to doubt their antislavery optimism, they had nonetheless utilized the mores of the American nation-state to construct a reform program of freedom and uplift that gave birth to a long tradition of black abolitionism.

NOTES

1. *Minutes of the Proceedings of the Eleventh American Convention for Promoting the Abolition of Slavery and Improving the Condition of the African Race* (Philadelphia: Kimber, Conrad, 1806), 35–37.

2. American independence overthrew millennia of practices of monarchy and ushered in the ideology of republicanism. The creation of American republicanism was informed by people's capacity for self-government and the concept of popular sovereignty rather than by popular helplessness and sovereignty in the hands of a monarch. American revolutionary thought warned that virtue and independence would have to replace the depravity and dependence of the body politic if the fragile experiment were to survive. Only a virtuous, knowledgeable, and independent citizenry could withstand the onslaught of corruption, greed, and moral decrepitude that republicanism's purveyors believed inevitable. See Gordon S. Wood, *The Creation of the American Republic, 1776–1787* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1969); Gordon S. Wood, *The Radicalism of the American Revolution* (New York: Vintage, 1991).

3. Leslie M. Alexander, *African or American? Black Identity and Political Activism in New York City, 1784–1861* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2008); Manisha Sinha, "'To Cast Just Obloquy' on Oppressors: Black Radicalism in the Age of Revolution," *William and Mary Quarterly* 64, no. 1 (January 2007): 149–60; Joanna Brooks, "The Early American Public Sphere and the Emergence of a Black Counterpublic," *William and Mary Quarterly* 62, no. 1 (January 2005): 67–93. For the political and federal constitutional limitations of antislavery in the postrevolutionary era, see Paul Finkelman, *Slavery and the Founders: Race and Liberty in the Age of Jefferson* (New York: Sharpe, 1996); David Waldstreicher, *Slavery's Constitution: From Revolution to Ratification* (New York: Hill and Wang, 2010); George Van Cleve, *A Slaveholder's Union: Slavery, Politics, and the Constitution in the Early American Republic* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2010). For the stance that the American Revolution and resulting nation-state created ideas of race and racism, see Duncan J. Macleod, *Slavery, Race, and the American Revolution* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1974); Barbara Fields, "Ideology and Race in American History," in *Region, Race, and Reconstruction: Essays in Honor of C. Vann Woodward* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992); Joanne Pope Melish, *Disowning Slavery: Gradual Emancipation and "Race" in New England, 1780–1860* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1998). For the expansion of American slavery, see Adam Rothman, *Slave Country: American Expansion and the Origins of the Deep South* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2007); Edward E. Baptist, *The Half Has Never Been Told: Slavery and the Making of American Capitalism* (New York: Basic, 2014). John Saillant's work on late-eighteenth-century black Calvinist minister Lemuel Haynes provides a noteworthy exception to the general interpretation of republicanism as a racially exclusive ideology. See John Saillant, "Lemuel Haynes's Black Republicanism and the American Republican Tradition, 1775–1820," *Journal of the Early Republic* 14, no. 3 (Fall 1994): 293–324; John Saillant, *Black Puritan, Black Republican: The Life*

and Thought of Lemuel Haynes, 1753–1833 (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003). Haynes's republican-driven antislavery likewise imagined a racially inclusive society wherein slavery's abolition would be coupled with African Americans' membership in the body politic of the new nation. Unlike the black abolitionists profiled here, however, Haynes lacked white allies within the New England antislavery community who shared his vision.

4. For a sampling of literature on the black presence in the early American public sphere, see Craig Steven Wilder, *In the Company of Black Men: The African Influence on African American Culture in New York City* (New York: New York University Press, 2001); Alexander, *African or American?*; Mitch Kachun, *Festivals of Freedom: Memory and Meaning in African American Emancipation Celebrations, 1808–1815* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2003); Dickson Bruce Jr., *The Origins of African American Literature, 1680–1865* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2002); Erica L. Ball, *To Live an Antislavery Life: Personal Politics and the Black Antebellum Middle Class* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2012); Richard Newman, Patrick Rael, and Phillip Lapsansky, eds., *Pamphlets of Protest: An Anthology of Early African American Protest Literature, 1790–1860* (New York: Routledge, 2001); James Sidbury, *Becoming African in America: Race and Nation in the Early Black Atlantic* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007); Lara Langer Cohen and Jordan Alexander Stein, *Early African American Print Culture* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2012); Leslie M. Harris, *In The Shadow of Slavery: African Americans in New York City, 1626–1863* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003); David Gellman, *Emancipating New York: The Politics of Slavery and Freedom, 1777–1827* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2006); Patrick Rael, *Black Identity and Black Protest in the Antebellum North* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2002); David Waldstreicher, *In the Midst of Perpetual Fetes: The Making of American Nationalism, 1776–1820* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1997).

5. An Act for the Gradual Abolition of Slavery, in *Am I Not a Man and a Brother: The Antislavery Crusade of Revolutionary America, 1688–1788*, ed. Roger Bruns (New York: Chelsea House, 1977), 446–48.

6. Marion Thompson Wright, "New Jersey Laws and the Negro," *Journal of Negro History* 28, no. 2 (April 1943): 175.

7. "A Citizen of Color," *New York Evening Post*, November 1, 1814.

8. Edgar J. McManus, *Black Bondage in the North* (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1966), 178.

9. Census data derived from the University of Virginia Historical Census Browser, http://fisher.lib.virginia.edu/collections/stats/histcensus/index.html; Gary B. Nash, "Forging Freedom: The Emancipation Experience in the Northern Seaport Cities, 1775–1820," in *Slavery and Freedom in the Age of the American Revolution*, ed. Ira Berlin and Ronald Hoffman (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 1983), 5.

10. Gary B. Nash, *Forging Freedom: The Formation of Philadelphia's Black Community, 1720–1840* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1988), 148–53; Shane White,

Somewhat More Independent: The End of Slavery in New York City, 1770–1810 (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1991), 158–61.

11. Richard Allen, *The Life Experience and Gospel Labors of the Reverend Richard Allen* (Philadelphia: Martin and Boden, 1833), 5–6; Richard S. Newman, *Freedom's Prophet: Bishop Richard Allen, the A.M.E. Church, and the Black Founding Fathers* (New York: New York University Press, 2008), 35. Newman's biography is the most complete secondary account of Allen's life available.

12. Allen, *Life Experience*, 9–12.

13. "Sketch of the Rev. Absalom Jones," in William Douglass, *Annals of the First African Church in the United States of America, Now Styled the African Episcopal Church of St. Thomas* (Philadelphia: King and Baird, 1862), 119–22. Douglass, a black historian and minister of Philadelphia's St. Thomas African Church, published a short biographical account of Jones penned sometime before his death in 1818. See also Nash, *Forging Freedom*, 67–68.

14. Peter Williams Jr., "To the Citizens of New York," *African Repository and Colonial Journal* 10 (1834): 186–88, reprinted in *The Mind of the Negro as Reflected in Letters Written during the Crisis*, ed. Carter Woodson (Washington, D.C.: Association for the Study of Negro Life and History, 1926), 631.

15. On the lives of the Williamses, see Kyle T. Bulthuis, "Peter Williams Sr.," in *African American National Biography*, ed. Henry Louis Gates Jr. and Evelyn Brooks Higginbotham (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008), 8:342–43; Williams, "To the Citizens of New York," 630–31; Graham Hodges, "Peter Williams Jr.," in *African American National Biography*, ed. Gates and Higginbotham, 8:341; *Commercial Advertiser* (New York), February 21, 1824.

16. For a eulogy of Henry Sipkins, see *Colored American* (New York), November 7, 24, 1838. For what little is known about John Teasman's educational career, see Robert J. Swann, "John Teasman: African-American Educator and the Emergence of Community in Early Black New York City, 1787–1815," *Journal of the Early Republic* 12, no. 3, (Autumn 1992): 331–56.

17. For an overview of the development of black communal institutions in early national Philadelphia and New York, see Douglass, *Annals*, 15–46; Julie Winch, *Philadelphia's Black Elite: Activism, Accommodation, and the Struggle for Autonomy, 1787–1848* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1988), 5–7; Daniel Perlman, "Organizations of the Free Negro in New York City, 1800–1860," *Journal of Negro History* 56, no. 3 (July 1971): 181–84. For the founding ideals of two of these institutions, see "Constitution and Rules to Be Observed and Kept by the Friendly Society of St. Thomas African Church," and "Constitution of the African Marine Fund, for the Relief of the Distressed Orphans, and Poor Members of This Fund," both in *Early Negro Writing, 1760–1837*, ed. Dorothy Porter (Boston: Beacon, 1971), 28–32, 42–44. In their rules, guidelines, and overall shape, the free black societies mirrored the plethora of white social improvement societies that popped up in this same period. The New York African Society for Mutual Relief's first president cast the group as

one of many formed at that time when he noted that a "spirit of Liberty, improvement, and philanthropy pervades the people" of the United States and that "societies for the purpose of spreading useful knowledge, diffusing virtuous principles" were "sprouting up everywhere" (William Hamilton, "An Address to the African Society, for Mutual Relief, Delivered in the Universalist Church, January 2, 1809," in *Early Negro Writing*, ed. Porter, 39). For an analysis of the New York societies that places them in African rather than American cultural contexts, see Wilder, *In the Company*. On the establishment of independent black churches in early national America, see Newman, *Freedom's Prophet*; Allen, *Life Experience*; Christopher Rush, *A Short Account of the Rise and Progress of the African A.M.E. Church in America* (New York: Zullie, 1866); Nash, *Forging Freedom*, 110–21; Kyle Bulthius, *Four Steeples over the City Streets: Religion and Society in New York's Early Republic Congregations* (New York: New York University Press, 2014).

18. Peter Williams Jr., *An Oration on the Abolition of the Slave Trade, Delivered in the African Church, in the City of New-York, January 1, 1808* (New York: Wood, 1808), 20–21.

19. Richard Allen, "Eulogy of George Washington," *Philadelphia Gazette*, December 31, 1799.

20. Henry Sipkins, *Oration on the Abolition of the Slave Trade; Delivered in the African Church, in the City of New-York, January 2, 1809* (New York: Totten, 1809), 17; Williams, *Oration*, 26.

21. Henry Johnson, *An Oration on the Abolition of the Slave Trade, Delivered in the African Church in New-York, January 1, 1810* (New York: Totten, 1810), 13–14.

22. Richard Allen, "Eulogy of George Washington," *Philadelphia Gazette*, December 31, 1799.

23. Absalom Jones, *A Thanksgiving Sermon, Preached January 1, 1808, in St. Thomas's, or the African Episcopal, Church, Philadelphia: On Account of the Abolition of the African Slave Trade, on That Day, by the Congress of the United States* (Philadelphia: Fry and Kammerer, 1808), 17.

24. Joseph Sidney, *An Oration Commemorative of the Abolition of the Slave Trade in the United States; Delivered before the Wilberforce Philanthropic Association of the City of New-York, on the Second of January, 1809* (New York: Seymour, 1809), 8–9, 14. For free black New York Federalist electoral meetings, see the *Spirit of '76*, April 25, 1809; *New York Herald*, April 30, 1808; *Commercial Advertiser* (New York), November 9, 12, 1813; *New-York Evening Post*, November 8, 11, 1813.

25. Sidney, *Oration*, 15.

26. Johnson, *Oration*, 14.

27. George Lawrence, *An Oration on the Abolition of the Slave Trade, Delivered on the First Day of January, 1813, in the African Methodist Episcopal Church* (New York: Hardcastle and Van Pelt, 1813), 11.

28. Williams, *Oration*, 26.

29. Johnson, *Oration*, 11–12.

30. Adam Carman, *An Oration on the Abolition of the Slave Trade, Delivered at the Fourth Anniversary of the Abolition of the Slave Trade, in the Methodist Episcopal Church, in Second-Street, New York, January 1, 1811* (New York: Totten, 1811), 19.

31. Sipkins, *Oration*, 20

32. Carman, *Oration*, 20; Johnson, *Oration*, 13, 20.

33. This concession about the potential unsuitability of former slaves for civil and civic membership was likewise made by white abolitionists, who also dismissed this critique of black liberty by holding to an environmentalist belief in the capacity of former slaves to be transformed into republican freemen. The idea of environmentalism referred to here was an Enlightenment belief that people were products of their surrounding environment and that human character was the by-product of society rather than fixed in the body of individuals. For the reform ideology of environmentalism among early American abolitionists, see Winthrop D. Jordan, *White over Black: American Attitudes toward the Negro, 1550–1812* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1968); George M. Fredrickson, *The Black Image in the White Mind: The Debate on Afro-American Character and Destiny, 1817–1914* (New York: Harper and Row, 1971), 1–42.

34. *Minutes of the Proceedings of the Tenth American Convention for Promoting the Abolition of Slavery and Improving the Condition of the African Race* (Philadelphia: Kimber, Conrad, 1805), 38.

35. *Minutes of the Proceedings of the Eighth American Convention for Promoting the Abolition of Slavery and Improving the Condition of the African Race* (Philadelphia: Poulson, 1803), 13.

36. Richard Allen and Absalom Jones, *A Narrative of the Proceedings of the Black People, during the Late Awful Calamity in Philadelphia, in the Year 1793: And a Refutation of Some Censures, Thrown upon Them in Some Late Publications* (Philadelphia: Woodward, 1794), 27; Johnson, *Oration*, 14.

37. Richard Allen, *Confession of John Joyce, Alias Davis, Who Was Executed on Monday the Fourteenth of March, 1808, for the Murder of Mrs. Sarah Cross; With an Address to the Public, and the People of Colour* (Philadelphia: Bethel Church, 1808), 5–6.

38. Richard Allen, Eulogy of Warner Mifflin, in *Articles of Association of the African Methodist Episcopal Church, of the City of Philadelphia, in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania* (Philadelphia: Ormond, 1799), 19; Russell Parrott, *An Address, on the Abolition of the Slave-Trade, Delivered before the Different African Benevolent Societies, on the 1st of January, 1816* (Philadelphia: Manning, 1816), 10; Sidney, *Oration*, 15.

39. Allen and Jones, *Narrative*, 24.

40. Hamilton, "Address," 36. For further examples of black abolitionists' faith in environmentalism, see John Teasman, *An Address Delivered in the African Episcopal Church, on the, 25th of March, Being the First Anniversary of Its Incorporation* (New York: Low, 1811), 9–10; Johnson, *Oration*, 11–14; Carman, *Oration*, 19–20; Lawrence, *Oration*, 11–12

41. "Proposition from Old Abolition Society," in Douglass, *Annals*, 39.

42. Ibid., 113.

43. *Poulson's American Daily Advertiser* (Philadelphia), August 10, September 18, October 29, 1804.

44. New York Manumission Society Records, 7:60, New-York Historical Society, New York.

45. Teasman, *Address*, 6.

46. Sidney, *Oration*, 18.

47. For Samuel Wood's printing of Williams's 1808 oration, See *New-York Commercial Advertiser*, December 28, 1808; *New York Gazette and General Advertiser*, January 26, 1808. The advertisement ran for three months. For one instance when New York's free black activists and white abolitionists had a tactical disagreement regarding the manner in which African Americans celebrated the abolition of the slave trade, see Minutes of the New York Manumission Society, 1810, vols. 9–10, New-York Historical Society; John Jay Zuille, *Historical Sketch of the New York African Society for Mutual Relief* (New York: n.p., 1892), 7. For an interpretation of abolitionism in this period that also finds consonance between the activism of black abolitionists and the Pennsylvania Abolition Society and New York Manumission Society, see Manisha Sinha, *The Slave's Cause: A History of Abolition* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2016), 113–22.

48. Bruce, *Origins*, 106. My analysis of these orations is based on close readings of all thirteen published speeches delivered in New York and Philadelphia between 1808 and 1815. For extended scholarly explorations of the orations, see Alexander, *African or American?*, 17–30; Bruce, *Origins*, 106–12; Kachun, *Festivals of Freedom*, 30–41. Alexander sees a split between black orators who advocated racial uplift and incorporation and those who encouraged African nationalism and colonization, but I do not believe that the documents substantiate this division. Bruce concludes that Christian Providence was the major motif of the addresses. And Kachun is interested in the orations mainly for the precedents they set in memory making and freedom festivals for later generations of black activists. Free black Bostonians also held annual celebrations of the slave trade's abolition, but white ministers rather than African Americans delivered the orations.

49. Sidney, *Oration*, 4.

50. Carman, *Oration*, 6.

51. Lawrence, *Oration*, 6.

52. Henry Sipkins's introductory address to Williams, *Oration*, 10.

53. Russell Parrott, *An Oration on the Abolition of the Slave Trade, Delivered on the First of January, 1812, at the African Church of St. Thomas* (Philadelphia: Maxwell, 1812), 4.

54. Williams, *Oration*, 12; Sipkins, *Oration*, 8.

55. Lawrence, *Oration*, 7–8.

56. Sipkins, *Oration*, 11.

57. Ibid., 9.

58. Ibid., 11; Carman, *Oration*, 10; Hamilton, "Address," 35.

59. For a penetrating look at the rhetorical and ideological links between white and black antislavery discourse in the revolutionary and early national eras, see Bruce, *Origins*, 39–143.

60. Hamilton, "Address," 35

61. Williams, *Oration*, 19.

62. Ibid., 19.

63. Carman, *Oration*, 11, 13.

64. Ibid., 13.

65. Sidney, *Oration*, 5.

66. Hamilton, "Address," 35.

67. William Miller, *A Sermon on the Abolition of the Slave Trade: Delivered in the African Church, New York, on the First of January, 1810* (New York: Totten, 1810), 11; Lawrence, *Oration*, 11–13.

68. Lawrence, *Oration*, 11.

69. Parrott, *Oration*, 9.

70. Lawrence, *Oration*, 13. According to these orators, whatever white American hypocrisy and failure to live up to revolutionary republican ideals of liberty and equality existed was located in the southern states rather than in the North. See Sidney, *Oration*, 7.

71. Miller, *Sermon*, 5; Williams, *Oration*, 19; Lawrence, *Oration*, 13.

72. Miller and Hamilton tweaked slightly the portrait of primitive Edenic pre-European contact in Africa by connecting Africa to ancient Egypt and insisting that Africans were among the "first learned nation." But the two men still portrayed European slavers as corrupting Africans and saw the end of the slave trade as rescuing Africa from the social and cultural degradation it had created. See Miller, *Sermon*, 4–5; William Hamilton, "An Oration on the Abolition of the Slave Trade, Delivered in the Episcopal Ashbury African Church, in Elizabeth-St., New York, January 2, 1815," in *Early Negro Writing*, ed. Porter, 392–99. On the slave trade orations as expressions of a black nationalist identity, see Alexander, *African or American?*, 17–30; Waldstreicher, *In the Midst of Perpetual Fetes*, 323–25, 344–47. For a succinct and trenchant critique of applying the framework of black nationalism to African American abolitionist activism in the early republic and antebellum periods, see Patrick Rael, "Free Black Activism in the Antebellum North," *History Teacher* 39, no. 2 (February 2006): 215–33.

73. Sipkins, *Oration*, 21.

74. Johnson, *Oration*, 11; Carman, *Oration*, 19; Sipkins, *Oration*, 21.

75. Lawrence, *Oration*, 12; Parrott, *Address*, 10.

76. Teasman, *Address*, 6.

77. On the argument for a black cultural and economic divide in early nineteenth-century Philadelphia, see Nash, *Forging Freedom*, 219–23.

78. Rael, *Black Identity and Black Protest*, 179–83.

"All the Inhabitants of This America Are Citizens"

Imagining Equality, Nation, and Citizenship in an Atlantic Frame

JAMES E. SANDERS

In 1822, at the very moment of Mexico's troubled birth as a new nation-state, a group of enslaved women wrote to Emperor Iturbide to demand their freedom. Liberty was their "natural right," they believed, since the new nation had declared "that all the inhabitants of this America are Citizens."[1] This letter should not have been written. A completely new and weak nation-state such as Mexico was at most the creation and creature of Creole elite nation builders.[2] Subaltern (or popular) social groups, such as these enslaved women, should not have been aware of the new nation's existence, much less feel they had a place in it. Supposedly ignorant of national political life, uninvolved in the public sphere, and preoccupied only with their immediate interests, they should have been concerned solely with the *patria chica*, the world visible from atop a village's bell tower. Even if they did not know this new nation's exact name, however, these women were aware of its existence and, beyond that, claimed citizenship in it, investing that citizenship with emancipatory visions of liberty and equality. For those excluded from the social body and oppressed politically and economically, new nations could represent opportunities to improve their status. Given the right circumstances, subalterns eagerly embraced nations, even if few elite political leaders thought to include them as citizens. While excluded by power brokers, subalterns such as these Afro-Mexican women demanded a place at the table of the nation.

As Latin American nation-states came into being in the 1820s, popular groups (including those of indigenous and African descent) claimed citizenship in these strange new constructs. A growing literature has established subalterns' appropriation of citizenship in Latin America.[3] This essay explores the effects of popular claims to citizenship and the conditions that made such claims meaningful. It argues that these claims had a significant influence on how the nineteenth-century public sphere imagined a "modern" nation. By the mid-

nineteenth century, the Mexican and Colombian public spheres rang with declarations of their societies' superiority over the United States and Europe since they had adopted ideas of racial equality and universal (male) citizenship—the enslaved women would not win their claim as citizens—as central to the nation's progress. Indeed, by the 1850s, the idea of being a modern, civilized nation in much of Spanish America became defined not around ideas of European high culture and manners or around ideas of industry, technology, and state power but rather around the notion that progress entailed creating nations of citizens in republics—a mentalité referred to here as an American republican modernity.[4] In an Atlantic frame, this is a striking reorientation of modernity's meaning, especially in regard to equality and race. The idea that equality and popular citizenship were central for the nation's achievement of modernity also refracted back and strengthened the positions of subalterns, especially Afro–Latin Americans, in the new nations. This essay will explore how the idea of the nation in Colombia and Mexico became enmeshed with ideas of popular citizenship and equality, especially racial equality, in an Atlantic framework of the imagined inequality and limited citizenship of the United States and Europe. Thus, the essay's scope is both intensely local to Mexico and Colombia (how subalterns appropriated and utilized ideas of nation and citizenship for immediate, concrete goals involving their social and economic lives) and transnational (involving ideas that moved across Spanish America and the broader Atlantic world).[5]

The essay opens by showing how equality had become central to defining civilization in the nineteenth-century Spanish American public sphere, in contrast to much of the North Atlantic.[6] It then turns to popular groups themselves, arguing that American republican modernity's political emphasis provided subalterns with a much more efficacious and emancipatory vision of progress that they could exploit, compared to other conceptions of modernity that ruled the public sphere earlier and later. Finally, it will briefly suggest why the idea that equality and citizenship defined civilization collapsed late in the century, under pressure from scientific racism and Atlantic capitalism.

During the independence struggle, racial equality became a key demand that patriots, especially those of African or indigenous descent, used to differentiate themselves from Spain, as Marixa Lasso has shown.[7] Yet after the war, most elite state and nation builders viewed the racially heterogeneous lower classes with suspicion and generally tried to limit their access to the political sphere to build a cultured, urban civilization imitative of Europe. However, by midcentury, pushed from above and below, racial equality reemerged not just as a goal but as one of the defining features of modernity. This process be-

gan, in part, as a consequence of the 1846 U.S. invasion of Mexico. While U.S. power brokers erected increasingly rigid racial divides to justify the war, the invasion encouraged some Mexicans to enunciate the differences between the two warring societies' visions of equality and race. Politicians regularly warned that Mexicans in general and especially Afro-Mexicans faced enslavement if the United States triumphed; given the establishment of slavery in Texas, such a scenario would not have seemed unreasonable.[8] The State of Mexico's legislature warned that if Mexico did not defend itself, residents would soon hear in "our fields the snap of the whip and the brutal yelling of the slave overseer."[9] As a result of the U.S. horror regarding racial mixing, *castas* (those of mixed racial ancestry) risked the worst treatment, even "extermination of the men of color."[10] In light of U.S. racism, Mexicans believed that their neighbor to the north lacked a truly republican society; instead, the United States was a "hybrid republic, with popular institutions and a refined aristocracy of blood" that constantly abused and degraded its "people of color."[11]

These encounters accelerated the long process by which many in Spanish America began to define racial equality as key to both republicanism and civilization, a foundation of American republican modernity. The newspaper *El Monitor Republicano* argued that Mexico enjoyed the "sympathies of the civilized nations" due to U.S. aggression and modernity based only on "fire and blood." In contrast, Mexico stood for the "cause of human liberty" against a nation that profited from slavery and "exploits a man and marks him with a brand of servitude as if he were a beast." Mexico supported "equality" against "a nation in which only one race dominates, humiliates, and degrades all the others." If the U.S. conquest succeeded, everyone not of "European origin" would lose their "political rights" and be subjected to a situation little different from slavery. Therefore, Mexico's cause was the "cause of civilization."[12] Shockingly, civilization was defined not by European life or military power but by equality. U.S. journalists and politicians bragged they were bringing civilization to an inferior and racially suspect people, but Mexicans reacted by questioning the invader's claims to modernity and civilization. As universalism and equality cemented their prestige within American republican modernity in the coming years, the Spanish American public increasingly employed U.S. racism as a mark of Latin America's superior claims to modern civilization.

While reactions to U.S. imperialism and racism helped promote universalism over racial division, so, too, did contests over the abolition of slavery. In Colombia and in Uruguay, abolition became one of the central tropes of American republican modernity. After Uruguay's circumscribed abolition of 1842, a newspaper declared that President José Fructuoso Rivera "had washed

away the black mark that had tarnished the luster of the Republic."[13] Another paper celebrated the purported end of the slave trade to Brazil as "a triumph for all Humanity."[14] Emancipation and the abolition of racial limits to citizenship, while a military necessity, were related to the American republican vision of modernity, as Uruguayans thought that true republicanism did not tolerate slavery or racial discrimination but that "monarchy requires class distinctions and social hierarchies."[15] In Colombia, in a speech celebrating the abolition of slavery on January 1, 1852, governor Vicente Fontal spoke directly to the newly emancipated, reminding them that their "democratic government," in the hands of the Liberal Party, had freed them and made them "citizens." There could not be a "true Republic, where the enslavement of a great number of our brothers endures."[16] Carlos Gómez, governor of Cauca province in southwestern Colombia, argued that "true democracy" meant the abolition of slavery and effective citizenship rights for ex-slaves.[17] When the Chilean Francisco Bilbao defended American republics' accomplishments, the first item he listed was emancipation, followed by the abolition of racial distinctions and of inequality before the law.[18] Slavery had become anathema to American republican modernity.

Beyond emancipation, Spanish American liberals (more likely to promote American republican modernity's tenets) regularly accused conservatives of racism and thus demonstrated liberals' support for equality. A speaker in Cali's Democratic Society blasted conservatives for denying racial equality and universalism.[19] A Mexico City paper, *La Chinaca*, rejected the racism of conservatives who claimed European superiority in the context of the French intervention in Mexico (1861–67) in hopes of imposing a European monarch. The paper crowed that after the invading French forces' 1862 defeat at Puebla, they now knew the prowess of "Indian and Mestizo Mexicans" in combat.[20] Mexico's victory proved wrong those "wise ambassadors who had assured that our brutish Indians would humbly and reverentially inquire on the health of the Spanish sovereign." *La Chinaca* explicitly blamed the *letrado* (intellectual) class—*los científicos*—for spreading false notions of Mexican barbarism in Europe. The French had expected to find "a mob of mulattoes . . . a tribe of savages, a horde of mestizos and brutish lepers" but had instead encountered a force of "modest but intrepid citizens."[21] Here, two views of Mexico emerge. By the European standards of modernity accepted by the *letrados* and members of the scientific elite, Mexico was barbarous and racially suspect. For the world of the public sphere, however, Mexico was made up not of uncultured Indians, mestizos, and mulattoes but simply of citizens. One vision was geographic, cultural, racial, and "scientific"; the other was political.

With abolition, the question of citizenship rights and racial equality came to the fore, and Spanish Americans took great pride in noting the absence of legal segregation and caste laws. In 1862, facing a Europe intent on imposing its civilization on Mexico during the French intervention, Mexican physician Carlos Santa María directly rejected "European progress"—defined for him by steamships, canals, railroads, industry, arts, and sciences—and instead argued that "the true happiness of social life consists in enjoying liberty and independence." "The comforts of material life," order, and "respect for property" that Europe offered bore too high a price: "degrading slavery."[22] Similarly, Severo Cosío thought that the French could offer not modern liberty or rights but only "progress of a dazzling and corrupt materialism."[23] France "wants a monopoly of commerce, [and] the superiority of races to change the destiny of the New World, which is the home and haven of the human species and of democracy."[24] This vision recognized Europe as having achieved economic development and increased state and technological power but saw a cost as well—monopolies, racism, and democracy denied. *La Unión*, a provincial newspaper from Popayán, declared Colombia "the vanguard in America" and explicitly justified this boast by noting, "Men of color are as esteemed as whites, each enjoying the same rights and guarantees."[25] Furthermore, the paper argued that Colombia had established "the will of the pueblo" as superior to all other powers and eliminated every "hierarchy" (race included) and "element of repression" from society.[26] Colombians and Mexicans knew that such was not the case in much of the Atlantic world and rightly trumpeted their achievement. (Of course, racism existed in Colombia, but that does not negate that such amalgamation of modernity and racial equality would have been inconceivable in the United States.) In Mexico, *El Globo* asserted, "Our Republic is the model for democracies . . . giving a lesson of progress to her powerful neighbor to the North, since she does not organize her social rankings according to tints of color nor racial distinctions."[27] While the United States was usually recognized as a model republic as a result of its political stability and economic progress, Mexicans felt that racism was a fatal flaw in U.S. claims to modernity. The power of modernizing visions is clear here, as both a cause and an effect, since most in the United States could not place antiracism as a central element of modernity. *La Voz Nacional* celebrated Union victories in the Civil War and the apparent desire to end slavery, which the paper claimed had always been a stain on U.S. institutions; in the 1860s, the United States was not in the lead but was just now catching up to the modernity already conquered by their American neighbors.[28] In both Colombia and Mexico, the public sphere imagined that North American racism and European monarchy were critical impediments to U.S. and European claims to creating modern nations.

It is of course both easy and necessary to point out the contradictions and limits of republican universalism. The male citizen automatically excluded women from the citizen body. There were further limits to universalism beyond gender; Indians who would not abandon their identity as Indians were often excluded from citizenship and persecuted. Citizenship could be a double-edged sword, a powerful tool used by subalterns to demand their rights but with risks and costs. In particular, liberals often insisted that previous identities, such as Indianness, be abandoned to claim status as a citizen. In this period, Afro–Latin Americans faced fewer contradictions in their pursuit of citizenship and equality, as they did not possess indigenous peoples' communal landholdings and local self-government, justified by the colonial category of "Indian," which many liberals saw as incompatible with the universal identity of citizen. In short, Afro–Latin Americans had much less to lose by pursuing citizenship in the nation: an explicit black or *casta* identity did not carry with it any legal benefits, so there was less reason to publicly defend such an identity vis-à-vis universal citizenship. (Although this does not mean that Afro–Latin Americans did not privately value their own racial or cultural identities, merely that they saw little need to publicly defend or insist on them.) These exclusions from "universal" citizenship are certainly important, but the emancipatory power of citizenship is just as critical. However, the trend in the historiography has been to dismiss republicanism, democracy, universalism, and equality as meaningless for the vast majority.[29] Subalterns themselves disagreed.

Indeed, across Spanish America, subalterns appropriated a language of citizenship and rights in the new nations. Subalterns especially seized on notions of equality, investing them with much more radical connotations. They were aided by liberal allies who sought to represent popular groups. In 1850 and 1851, while Ramón Mercado served as governor of Cali, Colombia, a popular uprising against conservative land- and slaveholders erupted in the Cauca Valley. Poor men and women attacked prominent conservatives, destroyed fences enclosing commons, and invaded and torched some haciendas. While all conservatives and many liberals condemned the attacks, Mercado sought to explain them as resulting from the continuation of slavery and the domination of landholding by a small group of "oligarchs" and "pseudonobles" who exploited the poor. The poor simply could no longer endure the situation now that "the star of equality shined in their eyes." While the disorder was regrettable, it was an understandable part of the "democratic revolution."[30] A decade later, David Peña, another ally of the Afro-Colombian rural poor around Cali, used similar language to justify land redistribution. Peña made his career by championing the practical application of liberty, equality, and fraternity. In general,

Peña believed in a radical equality and was the avowed enemy of any "social hierarchy" not based strictly on merit.[31] He argued that the solution to disorder could be found by aligning economic and social rights with political rights: "We would like the liberty and independence of the individual complemented with the recognition of their right to the land." Peña declared that the poor would not defend the nation (and the Liberal Party) based solely on grand but abstract ideas, asking, "What interest in the nation can someone have who does not have a secure home for himself or for his children?" He continued, "What good are rights that do not protect you against the avarice of the propertied on whose lands you live and exercise your labor?" The poor had to either submit to the capriciousness of landlords or die of hunger: "Either of these choices is a death." He demanded the reform of laws favoring landlords. Cali's Afro-Colombian rural poor had fought to support the Liberal Party in past wars; Peña closed his missive by demanding republicanism serve the poor: "The pueblo . . . has the perfect right to be protected against usurpation and iniquity."[32] Subalterns subsequently appropriated this language. The Afro-Colombian boatmen of the river Dagua, who ferried passengers and goods from the Pacific Coast to the central valley, asserted their place as citizens in a labor dispute: "We should be treated like citizens of a republic and not like the slaves of a sultan."[33] Equality had moved from being a legal category (itself very controversial, especially in regard to race) to a social and economic category as well.

While Afro–Spanish Americans eagerly demanded citizenship, indigenous peoples did so as well. While the essays in this volume are mostly concerned with people of African descent, in Latin America, the question of race and nation almost always involved (and sometimes centered on) indigenous peoples as well. Indians did not hesitate to use liberals' discourse against them, even in direct contradiction to liberals' program, which sought to divide Indians' *resguardos* (communal landholdings). In 1871, Indians from the Aldea of Cajamarca in Colombia wrote to the Cauca state president to insist that their *resguardos* not be divided. They noted how, under colonialism, they had been "beaten down by Spanish greed into the most degrading state of slavery and misery," but Colombia's "enlightened republican government" now proclaimed "equality, and works to improve the unhappy situation of the noble aboriginal race."[34] Of course, for elite liberals, equality meant ending *resguardos*. Yet for Indians, the rule of equality and a republican government signified their new status as citizens who had the power to protect their rights and be heard by the state.

Subalterns expected this language of citizenship and equality to matter. In Mexico and Colombia, after liberals seized power and the language of American republican modernity sounded regularly in the public sphere, subalterns did not

hesitate to hold officials' feet to the fire. In 1856, villagers from Huimanguillo (in Tabasco, Mexico) who claimed status as citizens compared the liberals' "good and just" new government after the Revolution of Ayutla (1854–55) with the previous administration, implicitly asking the state to prove its new legitimacy by assuming that it "is interested in the general welfare of all the inhabitants."[35] The pueblo of Chico (in Veracruz, Mexico), represented by renowned orator José María Mata, wrote to the president to complain about ousted caudillo Antonio López de Santa Anna, who had stolen an image of the Virgin Mary from their church and taken it to his hacienda. They hoped for better treatment from the new government since "the fall of the dictator has caused Mexicans to enter into the enjoyment of their legitimate rights."[36] Rafael Cataño, an ex-guerrilla who had fought in Oaxaca "against the reaction" and was now accused of deserting the army, protested that his rights must be respected or the constitution was nothing but "weak leaves of paper."[37] This was exactly liberals' conundrum. Would blatant dismissal of subaltern demands reveal their nation- and state-building projects as nothing but insubstantial words?

Since liberal elites defined their societies and justified their rule using a discourse of American republican modernity—the sovereignty of the people, republicanism, democracy, and rights—ignoring subalterns became much more difficult since they did not hesitate to question the nation's viability.[38] The Colombian and Mexican states were simply too weak to attempt to rule without some political legitimacy. A petition from more than forty residents of Paso del Bobo, Veracruz, most of whom could not sign their names, demanded that the liberal state intervene in a land dispute. The villagers had settled on land the state had seized from Santa Anna and had been paying rent to the state. However, two other renters had evicted the villagers, claiming it as their own hacienda. The villagers demanded that the state allow them to keep renting the land at the same rate as before. The petitioners claimed that the would-be hacendados wanted "to live by the sweat of the pueblo," but the villagers hoped that the new government would look after the rights of "citizens": "We expect that neither your Excellency nor the law will permit that the pueblo lives under oppression, as it would be, for us, as if the fight in which our poor Patria is now engaged in order to enjoy Liberty had been lost."[39] These illiterate citizens thus made a direct connection between revolutions for liberty and their need for land. If their concerns were not heard, then the revolution and the nation-state's legitimacy was already lost, regardless of the outcome of battles.

In Colombia, the residents of the village of Quilcacé, which included many former slaves or descendants of slaves, demanded help from the liberal state in a land dispute. The petitioners justified their request by reminding officials of "the

services the village made to the cause of the federation and due to the bloody sufferings that it endured because of its adherence to that cause."[40] Soldiering gave even those with little traditional status—in this case, poor and largely illiterate Afro-Colombians—a powerful identity as citizen-soldiers from which to make their demands. A few years later, the Palmira Democratic Society (whose membership included many Afro-Colombians) also petitioned for access to commons and public lands that haciendas had enclosed. The society reminded the Colombian president that "the poor class" has made "the very valuable contribution of their blood in order to defend our institutions, public order, and national independence and integrity. . . . These individuals have, at the very least, an unquestionable right to be protected by a liberal government."[41] States ignore their subaltern subjects all the time, but doing so is harder if those states have legitimized themselves via republican revolution and if subalterns have fought in those revolutions and still have their rifles and machetes.

Similarly, in Colombia, Sebastiana Silva petitioned the local government in Popayán for help in the return of her son, who was forced to work as a domestic servant (a not uncommon arrangement for poor children). His employers had refused to return her son, "as if we still were in the barbarous times in which the government allowed the slavery of men. Today, thankfully, we have a republican and democratic government that will not allow such monstrosities."[42] Silva was poor, illiterate, and a woman (and her invocation of slavery suggests that she was Afro-Colombian) but nevertheless expected a response from a republican and democratic government. She cleverly manipulated American republican modernity, equating slavery with barbarism and calling on the state to justify its own claims to democratic, republican legitimacy. Much more appealing to subalterns than notions of modernity directly were the tropes defining civilization and modernity under American republicanism—republicanism, democracy, popular sovereignty, and the universal extension of citizenship, rights, liberty, equality, and fraternity. Many members of the poor and working classes took advantage of this discourse, asserting their citizenship and claiming rights to promote their own agendas, whether protesting unfair monopolies, protecting landholdings, demanding pensions, or simply participating as equals in the political system. Such claims have been well documented in the state- and nation-formation literature.[43]

How the public sphere envisioned modernity played a key role in determining the effectiveness of subalterns' claims to citizenship and nation. Subalterns sensed the congruence between their understandings of liberty, equality, and fraternity (which varied between different subaltern groups) and those of American republican modernity. Subalterns could not easily pretend to be

educated in the ways and manners of Europe and thus had little to appropriate from the Europhile cultural modernity that had dominated the public sphere early in the century.[44] Western modernity (which dominated late in the century) and its focus on order and labor provided little space for most subalterns, regulating them solely as means of production. However, American republican modernity, triumphant around midcentury, with its political path to the future, gave them a powerful discourse to make their own. For discourses of modernity based on technology, high culture, or economic development, this language of citizenship and rights would not have mattered, but for a modernity based on republican freedom, such appeals carried great weight.

Of course, elites and state makers could simply ignore this discourse. They could make beautiful speeches about citizenship, liberty, equality, the pueblo's sovereignty, and the bright American future while brutally suppressing subaltern dissent. After all, what ruling class is not hypocritical? As E. P. Thompson has noted, "Only a ruling class that feels itself threatened is afraid to flaunt a double standard."[45] The problem was that nineteenth-century Spanish American elites and the states they ruled always felt threatened. In an era when the state was weak to nonexistent and nations remained undefined, elites lacked the power to simply ignore the discourses of nation, modernity, and republicanism that were critical to creating a new political system. Thus, they could not merely dismiss subaltern claims to citizenship, since the political systems atop which they sat rested on the discourse of American republican modernity. This discourse had great power as a result of its tight connection to defining and legitimizing the nation, especially given these nations' inherent novelty and hence essentially undefined character. Elites worried constantly about their new nations and whether anyone beyond a small circle of intellectuals actually cared or even knew such nations existed. How would new nations be created and legitimized? Unlike in later postcolonial environments, elites could not rely on the state to prop up weak nations or violently suppress dissent among those unwilling to submit to the nation. The state was, in most cases, simply far too weak before the 1880s to play such a role effectively in the face of more than isolated resistance. Beyond capital cities, the national state was often little more than a handful of employees commanding perhaps a building or two as institutional bulwarks, with little revenue and almost no coercive force. States were by and large miserable failures throughout most of the nineteenth century. Whether losing its territory, failing to enforce its laws and will on most of the population, collecting little income, failing to promote economic "development," or simply being massively unstable—subject to coups and civil wars—the nineteenth-century Latin American state was decidedly weak.

However, contrary to elite fears, throughout Latin America, subalterns—Indian communalists, Afro–Latin American slaves or freedmen, mestizo campesinos, or urban artisans—eagerly embraced the new nations and proudly and indeed vociferously claimed citizenship when doing so suited their purposes.[46]

Eric Hobsbawm has famously noted for Europe that "nations do not make states and nationalisms but the other way around."[47] This may have been true for Europe, but in nineteenth-century Latin America, although states came first, they were quickly passed in power and legitimacy by nations. Without the idea of the nation to lend the states some legitimacy, most Latin American states likely would have collapsed. If the nation's currency propped up an often bankrupt state for elites, it also presented them with the intractable problem that they did not control the new nation. The wealthy and powerful hoped that subalterns would dutifully accept the elite version of the nation, but that did not happen. Subalterns embraced the nation but did so only through a process of struggling over what it would mean. Subaltern men (and, with less success, women) also assumed that they would be citizens in full standing in the new nations, with rights and responsibilities they would help define. Elites could not control the new nation because they had little idea what they had wrought.[48] Either they had to accept subalterns' assertion about what citizenship and nation would mean at least a little, or the new nations would cease to be vital and become sterile, imagined communities. If citizenship, rights, and popular sovereignty had no meaning, then the new nations and their elite leaders also had no meaning or legitimacy.

Other imaginings of modernity would not have been nearly as conducive to subalterns' needs. Indeed, Western industrial modernity would have worked directly against subalterns' ability to claim a place in civilization while providing states and to a lesser degree nations a new way to legitimize themselves. Late in the century, in part to counter these subaltern demands, the Mexican and Colombian states and their political elites reimagined modernity and nation away from equality and popular citizenship and toward stability and economic progress. By the 1870s and 1880s, American republican modernity was replaced by new visions of modernity coming from the North Atlantic that measured progress not in terms of democracy and rights but along the more familiar yardsticks of industrialization, science (and scientific racism), technological development, and state power. Elites and state makers, pursuing capitalist development, came to see democracy and equality not as building progress but as blocking it. This reframing of modernity and restriction of democracy was a complex process; however, changing notions of race and equality were central to this transformation.

Letrados across Spanish America began to reject the previous era's racial universalism, instead embracing a Hispanophilic *hispanismo*. While *hispanismo* is often seen as a cultural reaction to U.S. imperialism, its origins lay in interior political developments within Spanish America. Spaniard José Ramon Leal, writing in *El Siglo Diez y Nueve* in 1884, urged Mexico to embrace its Spanish past and even to adopt "a moderate monarchy" as in Spain to secure its future. He noted that Mexico and Spain were natural allies, as they shared "interests due to reasons of race, of family, of victories and defeats, of Christian names and surnames, of language and literature."[49] Of course, this summary established an alliance on the basis of high culture and Spanish blood, which many Mexicans could not claim. *Hispanismo* would be the cultural armature used to justify the disenfranchisement, both literal and figurative, of Indians and Afro–Latin Americans from public life.

Other elites, now not limited by American republicanism's universalism and antiracist values, could more openly blame their societies' problems on Afro–Latin Americans and Indians, echoing the scientific racism solidifying in the North Atlantic. Colombian Regenerators referred to their popular liberal opponents as "barbarous blacks."[50] Colombian president Rafael Núñez lamented the weakness of his nation, which had a mere three million inhabitants, "the majority hardly civilized."[51] Quibdó's *El Atratense* reviewed the state of Colombia's Pacific coastal region in 1880, taking special note of the racial composition. It dismissed the Indians as having no "political interests" and not consuming anything other than what nature provided. The paper lamented the fecundity of "the black race" and noted that racial mixing had improved Africans' physical qualities although "the same has not occurred in their moral condition." *El Atratense* castigated blacks as lazy, ignorant, and superstitious, but if they could be made to work and forced to abandon their smallholdings, they might eventually live like "civilized man."[52] A few weeks later, the paper argued that "the privileged class" was composed of "the white race," which in Colombia's northwest was a minority; however, as the only class "that has intellectual life," this minority must direct society.[53] Conservatives and even liberals began to blame Colombia's problems on the character of its races.[54]

El Pabellón Nacional lamented the state of Mexico's three million Indians, castigating them as ignorant, unproductive, lazy, uninterested in national life, "only vegetating." The paper warned they acted as a great brake on the country's progress, and a comparison with the United States proved that Mexico must "invigorate our nationality."[55] By 1894, *El Estado de Guanajuato* did not hesitate to blame "the race weakness" of Mexico's Indians for the European conquest.[56] Many still thought the Indians could be reformed through educa-

tion, although *El Siglo Diez y Nueve* believed that the Indian problem was no longer that they might not be good citizens but that they did not consume as much clothing and foodstuffs as did the poor in Europe and the United States, thereby inhibiting Mexican industry. The paper proposed not only Foucauldian discipline administered by priests, schoolteachers, and the state but also, if necessary to make the Indians work, "perhaps a little violence, the restrained and paternal violence that fathers exercise over their children."[57] Justo Sierra was equally blunt: Mexico must "attract the immigrant of European blood" to improve the race lest the country move backward, away from "civilization."[58] Racial thinking only confirmed what had become dogma in the public sphere: modernity now existed elsewhere, in more northern, more industrial, and whiter climes.

In the 1850s and 1860s, Spanish Americans had taken pride in surpassing the United States in achieving racial equality; as the century progressed, however, some began to celebrate a shared trans-American project to isolate nonwhite lower classes. Mexico City's English-language *Two Republics*, writing after the French intervention and the U.S. Civil War, quickly urged a conservative reaction against radicals' excesses in both countries. In the United States, this reaction involved overturning Reconstruction, which had established nefarious "ideas of political and social equality between the educated, the enlightened, the moral and highly bred; and the ignorant, coarse, immoral, brutal barbarian."[59] For Mexico and the United States, the paper urged conservatives to overcome the efforts of "liberals" who "have more unfortunately adopted the pernicious error of considering all votes as of equal value," not distinguishing between the educated and the ignorant, between the wealthy taxpayer and the dissolute.[60]

Did discourses of nation, citizenship, and equality matter? It is easy to dismiss the moment of American republican modernity as insignificant in the Atlantic world. Yet subalterns thought it vital. Reigning visions of modernity allowed, encouraged, and made more efficacious certain types of subaltern discourse—under American republican modernity, a language of citizenship and rights could not simply be dismissed, as it certainly was later in the century under Western modernity. It is not possible to completely resolve the question of how the interaction of subalterns and elites pushed the public sphere to embrace a much more radical and emancipatory discourse than elites alone might have developed. Indeed, republican discourse was perhaps more crucial to subalterns, who had less access to the legal maneuvering than did the powerful. Elites often used the law rather than moral or political arguments to justify their claims.[61]

This discourse also provides insight into the Atlantic world and into easy assumptions of metropoles and peripheries. Latin Americans, especially Afro–Latin Americans, challenged the importance and meaning of race, positing universalism as a powerful opposing force. Edward Said has argued that imperialism created the habit and assumption in Europe that the gifts of history and intellect flow solely from metropole to periphery. However, the nineteenth-century Latin American experience does not just argue otherwise—that influence flowed from New World to Old—but also entirely dismisses Europe's claim to being the metropole.[62] Tracing the development of democracy and citizenship in world history requires taking into account the quotidian creations of nation and rights enacted by the pueblo in Spanish America.

NOTES

1. To Emperor Agustín de Iturbide, from "the female slaves" of Don Isidro González, San Juan, November 14, 1822, Archivo General de la Nación (México), Instituciones Gubernamentales: Época Moderna y Contemporánea, Administración Pública Federal Siglo XIX (hereafter AGNM-IG), Fondo Gobernación Siglo XIX, Gobernación, caja 54, expediente 15, foja 4. All translations by the author. This essay is part of a larger project on conceptions of modernity and democracy in nineteenth-century Latin America, and includes material, reframed, that was originally published in James E. Sanders, *The Vanguard of the Atlantic World: Creating Modernity, Nation, and Democracy in Nineteenth-Century Latin America* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2014).

2. For Creole nation builders, see Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (London: Verso, 1991).

3. The literature on nation-state formation has grown quite vast: key works include Florencia E. Mallon, *Peasant and Nation: The Making of Postcolonial Mexico and Peru* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995); Gilbert M. Joseph and Daniel Nugent, eds., *Everyday Forms of State Formation: Revolution and the Negotiation of Rule in Modern Mexico* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1994); Marixa Lasso, *Myths of Harmony: Race and Republicanism during the Age of Revolution, Colombia 1795–1831* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2007); Laurent Dubois, *A Colony of Citizens: Revolution and Slave Emancipation in the French Caribbean, 1787–1804* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2004); Antonio Annino and François-Xavier Guerra, eds., *Inventando la nación: Iberoamérica, siglo XIX* (Mexico City: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 2003); Mónica Quijada, "From Spain to New Spain: Revisiting the *Potestas Populi* in Hispanic Political Thought," *Mexican Studies/Estudios Mexicanos* 24 (Summer 2008): 185–219; Hilda Sabato, ed., *Ciudadanía política y formación de las naciones: Perspectives históricas de América Latina* (Mexico City: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1999); Hilda Sabato, *The Many and the Few: Political Participation in Republican Buenos Aires* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2001); Mark Thurner, *From Two Republics to One*

Divided: Contradictions of Postcolonial Nationmaking in Andean Peru (Durham: Duke University Press, 1997); Peter F. Guardino, *The Time of Liberty: Popular Political Culture in Oaxaca, 1750–1850* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2005); Elías José Palti, *La invención de una legitimidad: Razón y retórica en el pensamiento mexicano del siglo XIX* (Mexico City: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 2005); Sarah C. Chambers, *From Subjects to Citizens: Honor, Gender, and Politics in Arequipa, Peru, 1780–1854* (University Park: Penn State University Press, 1999); George Reid Andrews, *Afro–Latin America, 1800–2000* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004); Romana Falcón, ed., *Culturas de pobreza y resistencia: Estudios de marginados, proscritos y descontentos, México, 1804–1910* (Mexico City: El Colegio de México, 2005); Ada Ferrer, *Insurgent Cuba: Race, Nation, and Revolution, 1868–1898* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1999); Sonia Alda Mejias, *La participación indígena en la construcción de la República de Guatemala, S. XIX* (Madrid: UAM, 2000); Greg Grandin, *The Blood of Guatemala: A History of Race and Nation* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2000); Charles F. Walker, *Smoldering Ashes: Cuzco and the Creation of Republican Peru, 1780–1840* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1999); Guy P. C. Thomson with David G. LaFrance, *Patriotism, Politics, and Popular Liberalism in Nineteenth-Century Mexico: Juan Francisco Lucas and the Puebla Sierra* (Wilmington, Del.: Scholarly Resources, 1999); Rosalina Ríos Zúñiga, *Formar ciudadanos: Sociedad civil y movilización popular en Zacatecas, 1821–1853* (Mexico City: UNAM, 2005); James E. Sanders, *Contentious Republicans: Popular Politics, Race, and Class in Nineteenth-Century Colombia* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2004); Brooke Larson, *Trials of Nation Making: Liberalism, Race, and Ethnicity in the Andes, 1810–1910* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004); Richard A. Warren, *Vagrants and Citizens: Politics and the Masses in Mexico City from Colony to Republic* (Wilmington, Del.: Scholarly Resources, 2001); Cecilia Méndez, *The Plebeian Republic: The Huanta Rebellion and the Making of the Peruvian State, 1820–1850* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2005); Victor Peralta Ruiz and Marta Irurozqui, *Por la concordia, la fusión y el unitarismo: Estado y caudillismo en Bolivia, 1825–1880* (Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 2000); Peter M. Beattie, *The Tribute of Blood: Army, Honor, Race, and Nation in Brazil, 1864–1945* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2001); Celso Thomas Castilho, *Slave Emancipation and Transformations of Brazilian Political Citizenship* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2016); Clément Thibaud, *Repúblicas en armas: Los ejércitos bolivarianos en la guerra de independencia en Colombia y Venezuela* (Bogotá: Planeta, 2003); Gunnar Mendoza L., Rossana Barragán R., Dora Cajías, and Seemin Qayum, eds., *El siglo XIX: Bolivia y América Latina* (La Paz: Muela del Diablo, 1997); Ricardo D. Salvatore, *Wandering Paysanos: State Order and Subaltern Experience in Argentina during the Rosas Era* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2003); James A. Wood, "The Republic Regenerated: French and Chilean Revolutions in the Imagination of Francisco Bilbao, 1842–1851," *Atlantic Studies* 3 (April 2006): 7–23; René Reeves, *Ladinos with Ladinos, Indians with Indians: Land, Labor, and Regional Ethnic Conflict in the Making of Guatemala* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2006); Karen D. Caplan, *Indigenous Citizens: Local Liberalism in Early National Oaxaca and*

Yucatán (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2010); Michael T. Ducey, *A Nation of Villages: Riot and Rebellion in the Mexican Huasteca, 1750–1850* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2004); Patrick J. McNamara, *Sons of the Sierra: Juárez, Díaz, and the People of Ixtlán, Oaxaca, 1855–1920* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2007); Justin Wolfe, *The Everyday Nation-State: Community and Ethnicity in Nineteenth-Century Nicaragua* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2007); Geneviève Verdo, "El dilemma constitucional en las provincias unidas del Río de la Plata (1810–1819)," *Historia Contemporánea* 33 (2006): 513–36.

4. This essay is part of a broader project to reconceptualize the importance of democracy in nineteenth-century Latin America. See Fernando López-Alves, "Modernization Theory Revisited: Latin America, Europe, and the U.S. in the Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Century," *Anuario Colombiano de Historia Social y de la Cultura* 38, no. 1 (2011): 243–79; Hilda Sabato, "La reacción de América: La construcción de las repúblicas en el siglo XIX," in *Europa, América y el mundo: Tiempos históricos*, ed. Roger Chartier and Antonio Feros (Madrid: del Pino, 2006), 263–79; Guy Thomson, "Mid-Nineteenth-Century Modernities in the Hispanic World," in *When Was Latin America Modern?*, ed. Nicola Miller and Stephen Hart (New York: Palgrave, 2007), 69–90; Lucía Sala de Touron, "Democracia en América Latina: Liberales, radicales y artesanos a mediados del siglo XIX," *Secuencia* 61 (January–April 2005): 62–98; Isidro Vanegas Useche, *Todas son iguales: Estudios sobre la democracia en Colombia* (Bogotá: Universidad Externado de Colombia, 2010); Dubois, *Colony of Citizens*. I am interested not in what modernity "really" means but in how past actors employed the concept and what it meant to them and their societies. See Frederick Cooper, *Colonialism in Question: Theory, Knowledge, History* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005), 3–32, 113–49.

5. Thus while a limited focus on Mexico and Colombia is necessary to capture these local concerns, the broader processes occurred across much of independent Spanish America, if at different times and intensities. For the broader story, see Andrews, *Afro–Latin America*. Especially in regard to Afro–Latin Americans, Colombia and Mexico have been less studied than the Caribbean and Brazil. For Cuba and Brazil, see the valuable bibliography, Rebecca J. Scott, Thomas C. Holt, Frederick Cooper, and Aims McGuinness, eds., *Societies after Slavery: A Select Annotated Bibliography of Printed Sources on Cuba, Brazil, British Colonial Africa, South Africa, and the British West Indies* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2002).

6. For the public sphere, see François-Xavier Guerra and Annick Lempérière, *Los espacios públicos en Iberoamérica: Ambigüedades y problemas, siglos XVIII–XIX* (Mexico City: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1998); Pablo Piccato, *The Tyranny of Opinion: Honor in the Construction of the Mexican Public Sphere* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2010); Victor M. Uribe-Uran, "The Birth of a Public Sphere in Latin America during the Age of Revolution," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 42 (April 2000): 425–57; William Garrett Acree Jr., *Everyday Reading: Print Culture and Collective Identity in the Río de la Plata, 1780–1920* (Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 2011);

Francisco A. Ortega and Alexander Chaparro Silva, eds., *Disfraz y pluma de todos: Opinión pública y cultura política, siglos XVIII y XIX* (Bogotá: Universidad Nacional de Colombia, 2012).

7. Lasso, *Myths of Harmony*.

8. *El Corresponsal del Ejército* (Mexico City), April 10, 1847; *El Monitor Republicano* (Mexico City), April 16, 1847; *El Diario del Gobierno* (Mexico City), October 5, 1846, reprinted in *El Indicador* (Veracruz), October 12, 1846.

9. Mexican State Legislature Proclamation, April 26, 1847, in *El Monitor Republicano* (Mexico City), May 2, 1847.

10. *El Monitor Republicano* (Mexico City), April 30, 1847; *El Corresponsal del Ejército* (Mexico City), June 12, 1847. For U.S. attitudes, see Reginald Horsman, *Race and Manifest Destiny: The Origins of American Racial Anglo-Saxonism* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1981).

11. *El Monitor Republicano* (Mexico City), April 30, 1847.

12. Ibid., September 23, 1846.

13. *El Nacional* (Montevideo), December 15, 1842.

14. *Comercio del Plata* (Montevideo), October 2, 1845.

15. Ibid., May 20, 1846.

16. Speech of Vicente Camilo Fontal, Almaguer, January 1, 1852, Archivo Central del Cauca, Popayán, Colombia, Archivo Muerto, paquete 53, legajo 77.

17. Carlos Gómez to Secretary of Foreign Relations, Buga, February 10, 1851, Archivo General de la Nación, Bogotá, Colombia, Sección República, Fondo Manumisión, tomo 1, 588.

18. Francisco Bilbao, "El evangelio americano," in *Las obras completas de Francisco Bilbao*, ed. Manuel Bilbao (Buenos Aires: Imprenta de Buenos Aires, 1865), 2:428.

19. J. N. Núñez Speech, February 6, 1850, *Ariete* (Cali), March 2, 1850.

20. *La Chinaca* (Mexico City), May 8, 1862. See also Erika Pani, *Para mexicanizar el Segundo Imperio: El imaginario político de los imperialistas* (Mexico City: Colegio de México, 2001).

21. *La Chinaca* (Mexico City), May 12, 1862.

22. Carlos Santa María, "Ultimas Noticias de México," *La Independencia* (Durango), April 8, 1862, reprinted in *La Alianza de la Frontera* (Chihuahua), April 17, 1862.

23. S. Cosío, *La República* (Zacatecas), reprinted in *La República* (Chihuahua), May 10, 1867.

24. Ibid.

25. *La Unión* (Popayán), October 23, 1864. See also Lasso, *Myths of Harmony*.

26. *La Unión* (Popayán), October 23, 1864.

27. *El Globo* (Mexico City), July 5, 1867. See also Aims McGuinness, *Path of Empire: Panama and the California Gold Rush* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2008), 181.

28. *La Voz Nacional* (Guanajuato), April 14, 1862.

29. See E. Bradford Burns, *The Poverty of Progress: Latin America in the Nineteenth Century* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1980); David Bushnell and Neill

Macaulay, *The Emergence of Latin America in the Nineteenth Century* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988); John Lynch, *The Spanish American Revolutions, 1808–1826* (New York: Norton, 1986); J. Jorge Klor de Alva, "The Postcolonization of the (Latin) American Experience: A Reconsideration of 'Colonialism,' 'Postcolonialism,' and 'Mestizaje,'" in *After Colonialism: Imperial Histories and Postcolonial Displacements*, ed. Gyan Prakash (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994), 241–75; Richard M. Morse, "Claims of Political Tradition," in *Politics and Social Change in Latin America: Still a Distinct Tradition?*, ed. Howard J. Wiarda (Boulder, Colo.: Westview, 1992), 70–107.

30. Ramón Mercado, *Memorias sobre los acontecimientos del sur, especialmente el la provincia de Buenaventura, durante la administración del 7 de Marzo de 1849* (1855; Cali: Centro de Estudios Históricos y Sociales "Santiago de Cali," 1996), liii, lxv.

31. Belisario Zamorano, *Bosquejo biográfico del Jeneral David Peña* (Cali: Palacios, 1878), 26.

32. Manuel María Villaquirán Espada and David Peña, "Contestación," May 13, 1864, in *El Caucano* (Cali), May 21, 1863.

33. The bogas of the Dagua River to State President, Cali, May 15, 1878, Archivo Central del Cauca, Archivo Muerto, paquete 144, legajo 64.

34. Indigenous residents of Cajamarca Aldea to Cauca State President, Cajamarca, July 30, 1871, in ibid., paquete 112, legajo 29.

35. Francisco Zapata and others of the Municipal Corporation of Huimanguillo to President, Huimanguillo, October 9, 1856, AGNM-IG, Fondo Justicia, Justicia, vol. 547, expediente 36, 268.

36. José María Mata, representing el Chico, to President, México, August 5, 1856, in ibid., expediente 40, 298.

37. Rafael Cataño to President, Veracruz, October 20, 1859, in ibid., vol. 621, expeditente 3, 17.

38. For state legitimacy, see Antonio Annino, "El paradigma y la disputa: La cuestión liberal en México y en la América hispana," in *Relatos de nación: La construcción de las identidades nacionales en el mundo hispánico*, ed. Francisco Colom González (Madrid: Iberoamericana, 2005), 1:103–30; Brian Connaughton, Carlos Illades, and Sonia Pérez Toledo, eds., *Construcción de la legitimidad política en México en el siglo XIX* (Zamora: Colegio de Michoacán, 1999); François-Xavier Guerra, "Mexico from Independence to Revolution: The Mutations of Liberalism," in *Cycles of Conflict, Centuries of Change: Crisis, Reform, and Revolution in Mexico*, ed. Elisa Servín, Leticia Reina, and John Tutino (Durham: Duke University Press, 2007), 136; Wolfe, *Everyday Nation-State*.

39. The undersigned residents of Paso del Bobo to [President], Paso del Bobo, October 1, 1859, AGNM-IG, Fondo Justicia, Justicia, vol. 621, expediente 24, 155.

40. Residents of Quilcacé Aldea to Municipal Vocales, Quilcacé, February 14, 1864, Archivo Central del Cauca, Archivo Muerto, paquete 88, legajo 54.

41. The Democratic Society of Palmira to President, Palmira, June 21, 1868, Archivo del Instituto Colombiano de la Reforma Agraria, Bogotá, Colombia, Bienes Nacionales, tomo 7, 492.

42. Sebastiana Silva to Jefe Municipal, Popayán, October 13, 1874, Archivo Central del Cauca, Archivo Muerto, paquete 129, legajo 39.

43. For a review of the literature, see James E. Sanders, "Popular Movements in Nineteenth-Century Latin America," in *Oxford Bibliographies: Latin American Studies*, ed. Ben Vinson (New York: Oxford University Press, 2014), http://www.oxfordbibliographies.com/view/document/obo-9780199766581/obo-9780199766581-0126.xml?rskey=v99zeB&result=69.

44. This is not to say that popular groups never tried to appeal to European mores or identify themselves with European culture and life, an important part of their colonial repertoire of politics. However, American republicanism generally provided a much more efficacious politics. See Ann Twinam, *Purchasing Whiteness: Pardos, Mulattos, and the Quest for Social Mobility in the Spanish Indies* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2015); Marcela Echeverri, *Indian and Slave Royalists in the Age of Revolution: Reform, Revolution, and Royalism in the Northern Andes, 1780–1825* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016).

45. E. P. Thompson, *Customs in Common* (New York: New Press, 1991), 55.

46. See also Lynn M. Thomas, "Modernity's Failings, Political Claims, and Intermediate Concepts," *American Historical Review* 116 (June 2011): 734; Méndez, *Plebeian Republic*.

47. Eric J. Hobsbawm, *Nations and Nationalism since 1780: Programme, Myth, Reality* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 10; Ernest Gellner, *Nations and Nationalism* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1983). Partha Chatterjee also notes that for postcolonial Africa and Asia, nations preceded states (*The Nation and Its Fragments: Colonial and Postcolonial Histories* [Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993], 6).

48. See López-Alves, "Modernization Theory Revisited," 248.

49. José Ramon Leal, "Cartas íntimas á mi amigo Don Emilio Castelar: Séptima," *El Siglo Diez Y Nueve* (Mexico City), September 15, 1884.

50. *El Demócrata* (Palmira), March 13, 1879.

51. Rafael Núñez Speech to Congress, Bogotá, April 8, 1880, *Rejistro Oficial* (Popayán), May 1, 1880.

52. *El Atratense* (Quibdó), September 9, 1880.

53. Ibid., October 26, 1880.

54. Vicente Cárdenas to Sergio Arboleda, Quito, September 2, 1878, Archivo Central del Cauca, Fondo Arboleda, #1506.

55. *El Pabellón Nacional* (Mexico City), March 26, 1887.

56. *El Estado de Guanajuato* (Guanajuato), September 15, 1894. See also Mark Overmyer-Velázquez, *Visions of the Emerald City: Modernity, Tradition, and the Formation of Porfirian Oaxaca, Mexico* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2006).

57. *El Siglo Diez y Nueve* (Mexico City), June 30, 1877.

58. Justo Sierra, *Obras completas XII: Evolución política del pueblo mexicano*, ed. Edmundo O'Gorman (1900–1902; Mexico City: UNAM, 1977), 398. See also Mónica

Quijada Mauriño, "Los confines del *pueblo soberano*: Territorio y diversidad en la Argentina del siglo XIX," in *Relatos de nación*, ed. Colom González, 1:821–48.

59. *Two Republics* (Mexico City), May 30, 1868.

60. Ibid., July 1, 1868.

61. See Valentín Gómez to the minister of justice, Toluca, November 8, 1867, AGNM-IG, Fondo Justicia, Secretaría de Justicia, vol. 3, expediente, 667.5

62. Edward W. Said, *Culture and Imperialism* (New York: Knopf, 1993), 41. See also Zvi Ben-Dor Benite, "Modernity: The Sphinx and the Historian," *American Historical Review* 116 (June 2011): 638–39, 642–43.

The Racial Terms of Citizenship

Abolition and Its Political Aftermath in Northeastern Brazil

CELSO THOMAS CASTILHO

How does a broad view of the process of slave emancipation change our understanding of the history of Brazilian citizenship? Beginning with the premise that the concept of citizenship encompasses both legal rights and obligations, as well as cultural practices of belonging, and that it is historical—that is, changing in nature—this essay offers a fresh perspective on how the mass interracial mobilizations that characterized Brazilian abolitionism also created new ideas about race and political belonging. This contextualized understanding of the ebbs and flows of citizenship offers a more nuanced view of how the process of political participation has changed over time. For the better part of two decades, from the 1860s through the 1880s, the abolitionist movement invented new political languages and practices that broadened the political field, that brought to bear the idea of "public opinion" despite legislative measures such as the 1881 electoral law that drastically curtailed male voting rights. In politicizing cultural events (theater and carnival), organizing public manumission campaigns, and backing different slave initiatives for freedom, the movement hastened the decline of slavery. Under the preexisting 1871 Gradual Emancipation Law, slavery would otherwise have endured through the first decades of the twentieth century. Historians have long noted that the unprecedented public involvement of black and white women and men influenced the passage of the May 13, 1888, abolition law, yet much less has been written about how these mobilizations also opened a new era of Brazilian politics.[1] Beyond just a debate over a labor system, the abolition issue also prompted wide-ranging reflections on the nature of politics itself, on who set the terms of political expression, and on who defined where and how politics was practiced. In effect, this twenty-year period of abolitionist ferment amounted to as great a challenge to seignorial political power as had occurred in Brazil's first six decades of nationhood.

This essay explores the interplay between abolition and citizenship by probing the context of emancipation celebrations to understand how, even beyond the passage of the May 13, 1888, law, the abolition issue remained a touchstone for debating race and political participation. The processes of inventing abolition narratives should be read as a continuation of the struggles of the preceding twenty years over political access. The reactionary responses to abolition celebrations emphasized the perceived problems not only with the abolition law (the lack of indemnification) but also with mass participation in abolitionism. To discredit the memory of the abolitionist movement, former slave owners attributed political disturbances of the postemancipation period to the legacy of abolitionism, doing so through statements that rendered mass black participation as incongruent with the emerging notions of order and progress.

To properly situate these social and political dynamics, the essay focuses on the northeastern city of Recife. An important sugar port since the sixteenth century, Recife was a key site where abolitionist and pro-slavery mobilizations clashed openly.[2] It was Brazil's third-largest city in the 1870s, and between 10 and 15 percent of residents remained enslaved. The essay begins with an overview of the interrelated histories of slavery and citizenship in nineteenth-century Brazil before turning to Recife and the debates sparked by abolition.

The expansion of popular political participation arising from the abolition debates resignified the meanings of citizenship. Most important, the abolitionist movement constructed the notion that slavery constituted an affront to national ideals. It fostered the proposition that one's belonging to the nation rested on securing the freedom of everyone. To some extent, this discursive turn built on the existing ideal of legal equality that applied to Brazil's diverse free population as well as on the general narrative that Brazilianness reflected processes of cultural miscegenation. Unlike these established pillars of nationality, however, antislavery citizenship put the question of slavery up for debate. Previously, the discourses of legal equality and miscegenation worked precisely to mitigate any broader consideration of slavery. This had been a strategy deliberately pursued by Brazilian state builders. Certainly, Brazil's roughly three million free people of color (40 percent of the overall population in the 1870s) played a considerably greater role in public life than was the case in the United States on the eve of the Civil War. Afro-descendants enacted their place in society by joining associations and Catholic brotherhoods, serving in the militia, voting, holding many types of public office, and owning slaves.[3] Nevertheless, the expansion of slavery that occurred during the nineteenth century also implied an intensification of state practices that undermined the much-vaunted ideal of racial equality. For free people of color, the threat of illegal enslavement

created a permanent vulnerability, especially for the poor and unprotected. These institutionalized practices illustrated the racialized underside of the Brazilian citizenship pact.[4] In short, despite cultural and legal ideals of interracial belonging, slavery was at its height in the 1860s when the antislavery mobilizations began to take form. The subsequent public discussions of slavery as a national problem redrew the political field and brought more people into the fold than ever before.

Brazilian abolition debates centered on who would control the terms of emancipation. Slave owners, though obviously invested in the political and economic implications of the system, rarely openly defended slavery on moral terms. Instead, when confronted by the reality of growing popular opposition to slavery, they insisted on a course for emancipation that ensured their influence and, just as important, compensation for their loss of slave labor. Cognizant that British and French slave owners had earlier in the nineteenth century received handsome indemnifications for abolition, the Brazilian landed elite established this as a vital point of the negotiations. The growing interracial abolitionist mobilizations of the 1870s and 1880s thus prompted Brazilian slaveholders to respond with their own political coalitions. Despite Brazil's long history of slavery, not until the latter decades of the nineteenth century did slaveholders begin to create associations and electoral networks.[5] For their part, Brazilian prime ministers remained largely ambivalent regarding abolition during the 1880s. In 1880, for example, a legislative bill to set 1890 as the year to abolish slavery never reached the floor. Moreover, in 1885, the Baron of Cotegipe became prime minister, ushering in a three-year period of pro-slavery politics. Cotegipe's rule represents the apex of slaveholders' influence in national politics and offers a reminder that although the total number of slaves had been in decline since midcentury, the abolition debate was not linear and remained contentious until the end.

Cotegipe's successor, Senator João Alfredo Correia de Oliveira from Pernambuco, assumed the top position in government in March 1888 with a mandate to end slavery. This much was clear. Less known, however, were the terms that would shape such law. For example, two weeks before the opening session of the 1888 parliament, where abolition would be the first issue on the docket, the ruling cabinet had yet to settle on a final plan. One influential senator with ties to the São Paulo coffee economy supported linking abolition to conditional freedom, with the newly freed obliged to work for their former owners through December 25, 1888.[6] According to historian Jeffrey Needell, however, the intervention of Afro-Brazilian abolitionist André Rebouças proved critical. Rebouças insisted that the law's final formulation end slavery immediately and

without compensation.[7] Long a public advocate of abolition and a leader of the abolitionist movement, Rebouças occupies a place in the process that exemplifies the links between abolitionism and parliamentary politics. His role also illustrates the far-reaching influence that some Afro-Brazilians exercised in political affairs.

Local political debates evolved in light of the latest parliamentary developments. Brazil's princess regent, Isabel, who represented the monarchy at this crucial time while the emperor convalesced in Europe, opened the parliamentary session with a speech that unambiguously called for "the extinction of slavery, [which] is today an acclaimed aspiration of all classes."[8] The speech was read nationally, and it is a fair basis from which to reflect on Princess Isabel's part in the abolition drama. Although the historiography initially overstated her place, she nevertheless played a complex role.[9] For example, in a symbolically charged move, she hosted a luncheon at the Imperial Palace in Petrópolis (Rio de Janeiro) that included fourteen fugitive slaves.[10] Though slavery's days were numbered, entertaining plantation owners' "property" constituted a serious insult. Such acts prompted a political reaction from slaveholders.

In Recife, news of Princess Isabel's speech energized the last of the neighborhood-level campaigns for freedom. In printing her address alongside briefs on local politics, the press connected local and national politics, as had been the case for the previous twenty years. The clashing abolitionist and sugar planters' mobilizations arose from a context of intense slave agency that occurred through the courts, associational manumission campaigns, and flight. These actions by the enslaved and their allies had fueled abolitionist associational activism since the late 1860s and sparked a collective reaction from sugar planters. These mobilizations did not pit blacks versus whites; rather, both positions were ideologically framed in national terms. Abolitionists highlighted the importance of antislavery to national ideals of freedom, while the sugar planters in Recife as well as the coffee barons of the southeast emphasized slavery as central to national economic interests. While to some extent the two mobilizations comprised both white and Afro-descended adherents, abolitionist politics turned the notion of interracial belonging into a much more central facet of its program. In Recife as in most provincial capitals, enslaved persons accounted for between 10 and 15 percent of the urban population. By the 1870s and 1880s, most Brazilian slaves toiled in plantation agriculture—coffee in the southeast or sugar in the northeast. However, though most of the enslaved in Recife's environs worked in sugar, the sugar industry did not depend on slave labor—most employees were free. Yet the landed elite obviously considered slaves an important component of the labor force and of the political foundation. Despite

the fact that the slave population was declining in northeastern Brazil, the issue remained politically important. If such had not been the case, virtually all of the provinces outside Brazil's coffee belt—from those located in the far south and out west to those stretching across the north and northeast—would have abolished slavery much earlier.

The competing abolitionist and sugar-planter mobilizations in Recife took shape in relation to important local institutions. In particular, the Recife Law School became a crucible of abolitionist organizing in the 1860s. There, local students and those from across the country formed associations that worked to produce antislavery opinion, start manumission campaigns, and pressure politicians through the press, in court, and by creating increasingly radical abolitionist societies. In encompassing the enslaved population and the urban middle and elite sectors, the abolitionist movement established itself as a potent force locally, regionally, and nationally. One of the most active abolitionist societies in the late 1880s, the Club Cupim (Termite Club), operated a maritime route to freedom from Recife to Ceará, a neighboring province in the northeast. Though its own fascinating story of freedom is beyond the scope of this piece, Ceará was one of only two provinces, of twenty overall, that had declared itself "free" prior to the 1888 abolition law. An estimated three thousand people journeyed from Recife to Ceará between 1884 and 1888, assisted by an elaborate abolitionist network that counted on women and men from different social and racial backgrounds. While the Cupim emerged relatively late in the abolitionist campaigns (1884), their direct actions, coupled with the production of a play about the group in 1889, turned them into the main symbol of local abolitionism. At the same time, the sugar planters' countermovement also evolved from associational structures. It operated through the press and agricultural conferences to create its own political identity. Pernambuco's sugar planters positioned themselves in local government and emerged as core members of the regional elite.

In Recife, then, news of the imminent abolition law intensified existing political patterns: it fueled abolitionist associationism and triggered public interventions from the sugar planters. Although the abolition matter appeared resolved, new groups of law students still formed abolitionist societies in the weeks prior to May 13. This signals the importance that young men at the law school placed on participating in public life, a practice of associationism that enabled social standing and the projection of masculinity.[11] The law students and theater actors who joined the Núcleo Artístico Abolicionista, for example, could have simply joined any of the existing fifteen associations but opted instead to create a new organization.[12] The group's membership list included two

prominent Afro-Brazilian law students, Feliciano André Gomes and Manoel da Mata Monteiro Lopes. In 1909, Monteiro Lopes became the first national-level politician to affirm a black political identity, though he was not Brazil's first Afro-descended legislator. His ascent bridged the eras between abolitionist and republican-democratic activism.[13]

Sugar planters responded collectively to the prospects of abolition through the Sugar Planters' Association. Its members included prominent landed elites, among them Francisco do Rego Barros, a councilman in Recife. The local government, if ostensibly aware of the changing political winds on abolition, established a somewhat conservative approach to the new law. Influenced by Rego Barros and others, the local government distributed a circular that read in part, "You should free your slaves, not just because of humanitarian sentiments, but also *for your own interests*." In more ambivalent language, the notice continued, "With the slavery issue about to be resolved, it is in the interest of slave owners to concede manumission, as this will be the only means through which to keep current slaves as domestic or salaried workers. This is the only way to prepare them for freedom and free labor."[14] Printed two weeks before May 13, the municipal council's position summarized the main question planters faced: How would they remain in charge? One solution entailed the organizing of last-minute manumission ceremonies to reinforce planters' leading roles in the process and deny any hint of slave agency. Planters in Escada, in the heart of the sugar zone, headed their own manumission ceremonies in a ritual that was supposed to convey a bloodless, graceful transition to free labor. They freed 205 slaves just days after the opening of parliament in early May.[15]

At the neighborhood level, however, the abolition struggle raged in Recife. The parishes of Santo Antônio, São José, Boa Vista, and Graças formed commissions to free their neighborhoods in the weeks prior to May 13. It is not known approximately how many people remained enslaved in these urban areas, but according to the 1887 slave census, some two thousand people were still in captivity across the municipality, which also included several semirural parishes. The new neighborhood commissions blended with ongoing associational activism, featuring many of the same leaders who had directed abolitionist societies over the preceding ten to fifteen years. Antônio de Barros Sobrinho, who served as president of the Club Abolicionista, and Manoel Gomes de Matos, a founding member of the Nova Emancipadora and the Commissão Central Emancipadora do Recife, were on the Recife parish commission.[16] Relying on peer pressure rather than mass fund-raising, as had previously been the case, the parish commissions brandished the force of opinion as a way to reinforce the goal of local abolition.

The celebrations that followed the freeing of the first parish in Recife reinforced the idea that popular initiative provided the main catalyst for abolition. The festivities unfolded as the new parliamentary session was under way and made tangible Princess Isabel's words to the legislature: "The abolition of slavery . . . is an aspiration of all the classes."[17] On May 4, commemorations began at Recife's docks, where association leaders carrying the banners of the women's abolitionist group Ave Libertas as well as the Club Cupim stood out among the growing crowds. People marched through the downtown streets, while church bells rang in the background. Four freedmen carried their own type of associational banner, shouldering a replica of a *barcaça*, the type of small boat the Club Cupim used to transport people to Ceará. An hour into the activities, Gomes de Matos of the Commissão Emancipadora obtained an official census register showing no record of captives in the parish of Recife. After this euphoric moment, the crowds marched to the chambers of the municipal council to deliver their conquest. In taking over the streets, as individuals, members of societies, and as citizens, people claimed their place through the abolition issue. To be sure, associational leaders claimed the most visible roles in these processes, speaking of and for "the people" as they had since the 1860s. The freedmen's presence illustrated their integrated place within this public, representing the Cupim.

The same jubilant scenes were repeated across the country. People proceeded in leisurely fashion on the morning of Sunday, May 13, mindful of the telegram carrying the momentous news. Several thousand people, including parliamentary deputy José Mariano, pursued their usual Sunday entertainment and went to the horse track, providing the story line for Recife's May 13. The local press focused on the celebrations at the racetrack, and those celebrations were later re-created in theatrical works about abolition. After receiving news of the abolition telegram, the ecstatic Mariano descended from the grandstand and ran onto the infield to deliver a soaring speech. The races were called off, and Mariano led the multitudes from the track to the city center, making a point of stopping the procession at the palace of the provincial president so that he could appreciate the popular excitement. From the palace, the commemorations continued through the Santo Antônio neighborhood before culminating in front of *A Província* newspaper, which Mariano had founded a decade earlier. Joined by other leaders—Manoel Gomes de Matos, Martins Junior, Maria Amélia de Queiroz, Leonor Porto, João Ramos, and Barros Sobrinho—Mariano again declaimed the significance of the day before a crowd that had swelled to six thousand.[18] One newspaper reprinted the telegram and distributed it immediately. Nevertheless, the celebratory atmosphere belied the deep

tensions that abolition provoked. Runaway slaves clashed with police forces in the surrounding rural zones. According to the *Jornal do Recife*, a small *quilombo* formed outside of Palmares, where centuries earlier Africans had also caused major disruptions to the slave order.[19] The on-the-ground clashes playing out in Palmares prior to May 13 provide a reminder that neither the enslaved nor the planters relented in the struggle to define the terms of emancipation.

In the aftermath of abolition, its commemorations became an important site of popular affirmations of citizenship. These events took on great significance in light of the landed elite's increasingly open support for the overthrow of the imperial state. Indeed, eighteen months after the May 13 "Golden Law," a republican-military coup deposed the constitutional monarchy and ushered in a new era in Brazilian history. The republican government heralded the promise of "order and progress." For now it bears remembering that as abolition commemorations unfolded, they added to the mounting challenges to seignorial power that had been building for the past two decades.

Associative groups continued claiming a place in public life through enactments of abolition. The Portuguese Association's elaborate festivities to mark the one-month anniversary of emancipation illustrate the themes and practices linked to such events. An evening parade combined special lighting effects with intricately adorned carriages to produce an appealing spectacle. In asking storeowners to light their lampposts to guide the parade route, the Portuguese Association tied the evening's success to the business owners' willingness to participate. Fittingly, the Portuguese Cultural Institute's own carriage initiated the festivities. A stunning visual, the *Diário de Pernambuco* called it "the best allegoric car we have yet seen in this city during patriotic celebrations." This was no small praise coming from the city's longest-running daily. The men walking alongside the float hung green, red, and blue ribbons from their hats to portray the intermingling of Portuguese and Brazilian colors. The main platform was transformed into a "*bouquet* of colossal proportions, with an assortment of flowers artistically blended together. From the stamen emerged a colorfully dressed *cabocla*, representing a *young Brazil*. She waved a white flag decorated with a simple gold-trimmed inscription—'Law n. 3335 of May 13, 1888.'"[20] A *caboclo/a* was someone of mixed European and indigenous background typically depicted with darker skin and in native dress to reinforce the differences between mixed Brazilians and supposedly nonmixed Europeans. Beneath the flowers, a Portuguese warrior stood guard. Dressed in medieval armor, he waved an engraved shield with the traditional seven castles and miniature cross emblems of the Portuguese crest. He embodied the old Portugal, while the *cabocla* evoked the familiar Indianist tropes used to represent Brazil.[21] The racialized and gen-

dered personifications of the two nations thus were on full display. The young girl on the float sprung to life amid the luscious flora while the male, European "conqueror of the moors," stood guard. The representation provided an ideal metaphor for how Recife's Portuguese community viewed itself vis-à-vis local society: in a tutelary capacity, as the embodiments of Old World heritage that bestowed tradition onto the New World. The procession ended at the provincial president's palace, where the Portuguese leaders handed him token relics of Prime Minister João Alfredo, Joaquim Nabuco, and José Mariano, in recognition of the Pernambucans who were central to Brazil's abolition history. The association's gestures carefully homed in on political leaders whose patronage was desired and telegraphed a message to Princess Isabel that was reprinted in Recife for all to appreciate. Signed by the seventeen-man commission, the association "affirmed its fraternal sentiments toward its American brothers for this conquest" and noted the place of Portuguese nationals within abolitionism.[22] One association member, Thomas Antônio Espiuca, wrote abolitionist dramas and formed part of the radical Club Cupim. Gushed the *Diário de Pernambuco*, "This should not surprise us, [as] these are the people from whom we descend."[23] The Portuguese community assumed its place in the civic arena through representations of abolition, assuaging, if for a few days, long-standing resentments about its privileged standing in local society.[24]

South of Recife, the Dramatic Club of Santo Agostinho burnished its image through a theatrical event. The playwrights and thespians of this association located in the sugar belt chose July 29—Princess Isabel's birthday—for a special performance of José de Alencar's widely familiar *Mãe*.[25] First performed in Rio in 1860, this play had been part of abolitionist politics in Recife since the early 1870s. The review of the 1888 performance highlighted the enslaved mother's role, played by Angelina, a local actress. Her one-name reference suggests she was probably of a modest background, of mixed race, or both. Angelina vividly demonstrated the enslaved character's "caring, tender actions toward Jorge," her freed son, who in the twisted plotline was also her owner. The slave mother shone on stage on the day Brazilians honored the mother of the nation. The play was an important happening in this small coastal town where the illegal slave trade had flourished for much of the nineteenth century, and the review noted the "filled theater" and the orators representing the different associations. The Dramatic Club added a freedom allegory to the end of the performance and evidently used real freedpeople to stage the breaking of slavery's chains.[26] A musical ensemble then led all in an inspired singing of the national anthem. In Cabo, as with the Portuguese in Recife, the memorializing of abolition spurred civic action, organized through associative participation.

The improvised staging of the freedom allegory at the end, though scripted and idealized, represented a very rare instance where people actually saw and imagined the freed as part of the community. The former slaves did not receive landholdings, which they no doubt would have preferred to a role in the play, but given political circumstances in which the landed elite had not let go of the abolition issue, it was an important statement to affirm links between emancipation, Princess Isabel, and the freedpeople on stage.

Former slaves also certainly made claims on citizenship through representations of abolition. However, their words and actions also rang sharp with criticisms about their prospects. In the sugar municipality of Garanhuns on June 13, 1888, the same one-month anniversary when the Portuguese Association literally lit up the Recife sky, ex-slaves carved out a part within the town's festivities. They requested a special mass in the town chapel, and the *Diário de Pernambuco*'s local correspondent noted that they gave thanks "for the restoration of their rights, though this was happening three centuries too late."[27] The rest of the day's events focused on local politicians who gave speeches and sang tributes to the imperial family. Nevertheless, the freed presented themselves as rightful members of the community. Their place, they suggested, had been "restored," and the abolition commemoration offered a context from which to affirm this point publicly, before those present in Garanhuns and the larger print community. If less spectacular than the other events, Garanhuns's celebration featured former slaves who took part in shaping the narratives of abolitionism.

The public and popular nature of the abolition commemorations no doubt exacerbated sugar planters' frustrations. Conservative sectors positioned themselves as victims of emancipation, as having been abandoned by the government on multiple fronts. On the one hand, they argued that the abolition law left them without financial recourse, while on the other hand, they insisted that abolition had unleashed new social and political forces that threatened the foundations of society. Of course, this perception of an eroding social order conformed to a very specific and seignorial sense of what constituted "proper" social hierarchies. Amid this context of planters' politics, new partisan formations emerged. More specifically, the sugar barons flocked to the Republican Party, turning it into a general opposition party to the imperial state. The Republican Party's embrace of "order and progress" thus rested on the sugar planters' belief that abolition and abolitionism were incompatible with a stable future.

The euphoric popular responses to the abolition law may have done as much to enrage the former slaveholders as did the actual terms of emancipation. Almost immediately after abolition, the landed elite in parliament organized bills to counteract "the damages caused to slave owners."[28] In framing their

indemnification campaigns in such terms, they linked abolition to damages and began a justification for further political action. Newspapers across Brazil printed such bills, affording the aggrieved political sectors an opportunity to imagine their grievances in national terms. In Recife, the *Diário de Pernambuco* quickly denounced these parliamentary efforts as desperate and out of touch, highlighting the lack of votes for indemnification but nevertheless characterizing the rural sector's political agitation as "concerning."[29]

If short of support in parliament, the indemnification campaigns stirred local action. In Recife, the Sugar Planters Association organized a series of meetings in July and August 1888 to expand on the demands presented in the indemnification bills. These well-publicized events occurred alongside the popular celebrations of abolition—for example, in the wake of the Portuguese Association's evening street parade. The planters lodged three central complaints, which were printed and submitted to government in petition form. First, the planters stressed the need for a rural police force, again intimating that without slavery, the order of rural society hung in the balance. Second, the rural police were supposed to enforce labor relations, an arrangement the planters felt the abolition decree threatened to destabilize. From their perspective, abolition had changed "their" workers into "vagrants," and to the state they complained, "You seized the slaves from us and have prevented us the means of reorganizing the labor system!"[30] Third, the planters demanded compensation, citing examples from other Atlantic emancipations, particularly France's, to argue that compensation and the creation of rural police forces were necessary elements of an abolition process. Without this vigilance, they contended that the "ex-slaves would not recognize the obligations incumbent on citizens."[31] The planters clearly saw their role in public life as dependent on the ability to dictate labor and social policy. They drew strength from the narrative that abolition betrayed and undermined their citizenship. The petition stressed that the province's collective good was entwined with the welfare of the agricultural sector and that any violations of their "constitutional rights" constituted a violation of everyone's trust in the government.

The planters' public actions drew an immediate response from former abolitionist leaders, who pronounced themselves "ashamed, as men and as citizens, by the imprudent support of former Prime Minster Cotegipe for this profoundly disturbing campaign for indemnification." They pointedly argued in a public statement that the "Africans imported to Brazil after 1831 [when the Atlantic slave trade was supposed to have ended], and their descendants . . . should be compensated." Abolitionists claimed that more than half of Brazil's enslaved population during the 1870s had been smuggled into the country between 1831

and 1850, a period when merchants flouted the prohibition on the slave trade. To prevent any future debate regarding indemnification, they asked to have all slave registration books burned.[32] Bahian abolitionist Rui Barbosa acted on this concern while serving as minister of the treasury in the early republic, prompting charges that he was attempting to whitewash Brazilian history.[33] However, Barbosa's actions were grounded in a very specific political context, and the Recife abolitionists' petition shows that other activists also saw the burning of slavery documents as key to countering indemnification campaigns.

The revival of abolition-related debates also folded into a process of changing republican formations. After abolition, the local and national variants of the Republican Party focused less on the principles of liberal democracy and instead embraced the late-nineteenth-century ideals of political modernity that professed enlightened elite leadership. In Brazil as in other parts of the Americas, reformist political programs explicitly correlated proper governance with limitations on mass electoral participation. This was perhaps an unexpected turn in republican politics, given that many republicans had previously been ardent supporters of abolitionism. After May 13, however, the Republican Party drew new strength from influential landowners who abandoned the two parties that had traditionally been at the center of imperial politics. This new brand of republicanism crystallized in Pernambuco in late 1888, and former pro-slavery associations such as agricultural clubs served as key bases for new coalitions. Especially in rural areas, republicanism quickly became synonymous with the tenets of federalism, where the promises of a more decentralized state would dovetail with local elite concerns for a disciplined and politically disenfranchised labor force. In January 1889, Republicans promoted cigar bands with labels that read "Indemnification or Republic."[34] Six months later, another national cabinet change prompted new parliamentary elections, and Republicans emerged as important players during these heated campaigns.

Republicans entered the electoral fray having already intimated that post-emancipation social relations had been made vulnerable by the lasting consequences of abolitionism. The Republicans produced public writings and speeches criticizing the levels of popular political participation in the election campaign, repeatedly referring to the levels of political unrest that had preceded abolition. The crowds at electoral rallies were commonly referred to as *capaganas*, a racialized slur for "thugs" or "delinquents." Close attention to black involvement had not been as public a concern in previous elections, so this link reflects a new elite strategy for reasserting political control. Afro-Brazilian political involvement surged and was stigmatized and politicized not only in Recife but also in Rio de Janeiro and Salvador.[35]

Francisco do Rego Barros de Lacerda's candidacy from the sugar town of Escada brought these tensions into the open.[36] He emerged from the political world of the rural agricultural clubs and prior to May 13 served on Recife's municipal council. In that capacity, he had made unusually spiteful statements regarding the imminent abolition law. A former Conservative, Lacerda blamed "the president of the tenth of March cabinet [João Alfredo] for the profound discontent brewing among Conservatives." He framed his new support for the Republican Party as fitting with the larger trend of Conservatives from across the northern provinces of Pará, Maranhão, and Ceará who blamed the abolition law for their defection from the party. It "broke with the rights to private property enshrined in our constitution," he explained in the letter announcing his candidacy. In borrowing from the issues raised in the Sugar Association's earlier petition to parliament, Lacerda advocated for a stronger policing commitment from the state, singling out the "highly inconvenient organization of the *black guard* as a constant threat to ex-owners, as provokers of a race war."[37] Lacerda's letter conjoins three processes: black collectivity, the threat to ex-owners, and the race war. He could not imagine a black collectivity coexisting as a social equal to whites: its mere existence indicated a path toward violence. Though he did not say so explicitly, readers knew that the black guard formed as a popular monarchical reaction to postabolition republicanism. Lacerda and his ilk nonetheless characterized the elections as pitting republican "order and progress" against monarchical "disorder," with the latter defined by black political participation. This view went beyond Lacerda. It was a campaign strategy intended to foment precisely what Lacerda said he was running against: racial hostilities. He overlaid race and class, turning the debate into a black "them" versus a white "us," when in reality "they" had been interracial in composition and ideology since the advent of popular abolitionism.

The campaign warning that a "race war" threatened Republicans was revived in the context of Antônio da Silva Jardim's visit to Recife. Silva Jardim was a fervent Republican living in Rio de Janeiro who had become known for organizing public meetings. On several occasions, these events ended in fierce clashes with the black guard. He traveled to northern Brazil to rally Republicans in 1889, arriving in Recife already well known for the trouble that followed him in Rio and Salvador (Bahia).[38] Silva Jardim planned two meetings in Pernambuco. The first, held in Escada, where Lacerda campaigned, quickly turned into a shouting match between Republicans and "about fifty poor men of color and freedmen." The latter were accused of yelling "vivas to the emperor" while Silva Jardim attempted to finish a speech.[39] Ultimately, however, 630 of the municipality's 715 voters rejected the Republican candidate in 1889.[40] Even though

they had a public profile, Republicans were a political minority in Escada. As a rural sugar municipality, it is very unlikely that any sizable percentage of the voters were former slaves or poor workers of African descent. Therefore, the opposition Silva Jardim faced could not have comprised solely "men of color." Yet antirepublicanism was described in "black" and "disorderly" terms.

The second of Silva Jardim's meetings, planned for Recife's city center, was subsumed by a public countergathering called by the Liberal *A Provincia*. The republican meeting was called off at the last minute in the ultimate recognition of the power of José Mariano and his followers. Claims to citizenship, in this instance, rested on literally taking over public space.[41] The Marianistas celebrated their victory, marching through the surrounding streets and chanting, "Vivas to the monarchy and death to the republic!" Described as *pessoas do povo* (common folk), these supporters of Mariano included freedpeople. Republicans feared that the *capangas* (henchmen) would again mobilize on voting day and declared that they would "not be surprised to see Mariano proceed with this 'anonymous element' that has already prevented the Silva Jardim meeting in Recife."[42] In the end, then, Silva Jardim's visit to Pernambuco probably mobilized monarchists as much as it did republicans, and in so doing it confirmed republican fears about mass political participation.

Following Silva Jardim's departure, the Liberal turned Republican Ambrósio Machado publicly excoriated Mariano and the growing antirepublican sentiment. The two men spent a month trading polemics in the press, not only polarizing the two camps but also maintaining the newspapers as key mediators of this debate. Incensed by the recent happenings, Ambrósio Machado railed against the "ignorant and reckless multitude that [Mariano] calls *his people*" and charged that "the abolition issue encouraged him to cultivate this turbulent strategy, focused on taking as much advantage as possible of the abolitionist movement."[43] Ambrósio Machado, Lacerda, and their fellows did not realize that "the people" made deliberate decisions about when and how to engage the political arena and that joining Mariano's networks constituted a sensible choice.

Mariano, in turn, fed the dispute with six letters published in August 1889 that depicted differing opinions on abolition as the principal difference between Republicans and Liberals. This framing glossed over the glaring inconsistencies within Mariano's own party—Liberal leaders, too, had clung to the slave system as long as possible. Nevertheless, by taking on Ambrósio Machado in the press, the politically stronger Mariano could paint the entire republican movement as resentful slavocrats. Mariano moved quickly, first picking apart Ambrósio Machado's past affiliations with Liberals and Conservatives and ar-

guing that his shifting commitments reflected his desire to align himself with the party most against popular abolitionism. Mariano then went after Ambrósio Machado's ideas about popular political participation, detailing how they evolved from the logic of a slave order: "He always tolerated black slavery, and now he wants a dictatorship over the white proletariat and the slave descendant, because on that issue of governance, it is not for everyone; it's only for a rich nobleman who still misses the plantation and slave quarters, and it is to those times that he wants us to return."[44] Mariano thus illuminated the racialist dimensions of the new republicanism.

In the 1889 elections, Republicans lost every seat they disputed in Pernambuco. In the two most urban districts of Recife, Republican candidates received less than 10 percent of the votes. In the southern sugar belt, Ambrósio Machado finished a distant third among the three candidates, recording one-fifth as many votes as the winner. Overall, Liberal candidates had the most success, in no small part as a consequence of the patronage networks extending from the Liberal prime minister. Nabuco and Mariano won reelection in Recife's First and Second Districts: running against Conservative Machado Portela for the fourth time, Nabuco won nearly three times as many votes as his opponent.[45] This weak showing belied Republicans' influence on public discourse in what turned out to be the last imperial elections. Reactions from the losing Conservatives incorporated republican fears of mass participation. The presentation of these "disturbances" in racialized terms, with references to *capangas* and *flor da gente* (also a racialized slur), built on the connections among abolition, disorderliness, and blackness. In two instances, the denunciations stressed that *capangas* and *grupos de bravos* (gangs) had descended on Escada from Recife.[46] The use of such terms implied that these "terror-spreading" people were not only disturbing the political process through their presence but literally moving into an area that was not theirs. This was, of course, a very simplistic and selective view of the historical relationship between place and politics during the Brazilian Empire: presidents were appointed to govern provinces other than the ones in which they lived, and in some cases, politicians represented districts other than those to which they were native (for example, Joaquim Nabuco, 1885). Nevertheless, during the 1889 elections, press attacks focused not on city residents turned rural candidates but on the members of the populace, including blacks, who went to the sugar region to cast their influence, if not their vote, on Election Day.

The processes that led to freedom for at least half a million people in 1888 also sparked new considerations of race and political belonging. The long struggle for emancipation clearly wore down the landed elite and ultimately re-

invigorated their efforts to foreclose popular political activity. The sugar planters' angst over indemnification may have had less to do with the financials of the agricultural economy and more to do with what they perceived as growing social and political threats. The rhetoric regarding indemnification nevertheless fed larger calls to address social disorder, and such racialized fears about mass political participation formed part of the 1889 electoral discourse. The process and narratives of abolition remained contentious sites of public debate well beyond the end of slavery, and popular struggles for political participation were—and remain—central to the production of racialized constructions of citizenship.[47]

As the other essays in this volume suggest, slavery was indeed central to the making of American societies. African slavery was vital not only to larger developments in the history of Atlantic capitalism but to local-level social practices of race and belonging. Whether in major export zones like the Brazilian southeast or in less economically dynamic regions, the terms of slavery were intricately entwined with political power. A challenge to the former was unquestionably a challenge to the latter, and these essays thus open research possibilities for better understanding the political history of American societies.

NOTES

This essay includes material and ideas from "'Celebrations of Freedom': Abolition and the Changing Debates over Citizenship," in Celso Thomas Castilho, *Slave Emancipation and Transformations in Brazilian Political Citizenship* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2016); used by permission of University of Pittsburgh Press.

1. For an overview of Brazilian abolition historiography since 2001, see Barbara Weinstein, "The Decline of the Progressive Planter and the Rise of Subaltern Agency: Shifting Narratives of Slave Emancipation in Brazil," in *Reclaiming the Political in Latin American History: Essays from the North*, ed. Gilbert Joseph (Durham: Duke University Press, 2001), 81–101. Key books from the 1990s include Sidney Chalhoub, *Visões da liberdade: uma história das últimas décadas da escravidão na corte* (São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 1990); Maria Helena Machado, *O plano e o pânico: os movimentos sociais na década da abolição* (São Paulo: EDUSP, 1994); Keila Grinberg, *Liberata, a lei da ambigüidade: as ações de liberdade da Corte de Apelação do Rio de Janeiro no século XIX* (Rio de Janeiro: Relume Dumará, 1994); Hebe Mattos de Castro, *As cores do silêncio: os significados da liberdade no sudeste escravista* (Rio de Janeiro: Arquivo Nacional, 1995). More recent works include Roger Kittleson, "Women and Notions of Womanhood in Brazilian Abolitionism," in *Gender and Slave Emancipation in the Atlantic World*, ed. Pamela Scully and Diana Paton (Durham: Duke University Press, 2005), 99–114; Dale Graden, *From Slavery to Freedom in Brazil: Bahia, 1835–1900* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2006); Walter Fraga Filho, *Encruzilhadas da liberdade:*

História de escravos e libertos na Bahia, 1870–1910 (Campinas: Editora da UNICAMP, 2006); Thomas Holloway, "The Defiant Life and Forgotten Death of Apulco de Castro: Race, Power, and Historical Memory," *Estudios Interdisciplinarios de América Latina y el Caribe* 19, no. 1 (January–June 2007), http://www1.tau.ac.il/eial/; Celso Castilho and Camillia Cowling, "Funding Freedom, Popularizing Politics: Abolitionism and Local Emancipation Funds in 1880s Brazil," *Luso-Brazilian Review* 47, no. 1 (Spring 2010): 90–120; Camillia Cowling, *Conceiving Freedom: Women of Colour, Gender, and the Abolition of Slavery in Havana and Rio de Janeiro* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2013); Angela Alonso, *Flores, votos e balas: o movimento abolicionista brasileiro, 1868–1888* (São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 2015); Maria Helena Machado and Celso Thomas Castilho, eds., *Tornando-Se Livre: Agentes históricos e lutas sociais no processo da abolição* (São Paulo: EDUSP, 2015); Castilho, *Slave Emancipation*.

2. An expanded version of this essay appears in Castilho, *Slave Emancipation*, 161–91.

3. Eduardo Silva, *Dom Obá d'África, Príncipe do Povo: Vida, tempo e pensamento de um homem de cor* (São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 1997), 112–55; Richard Graham, "Free African Brazilians and the State in Slavery Times," in *Racial Politics in Contemporary Brazil*, ed. Michael Hanchard (Durham: Duke University Press, 1999), 31; Hendrik Kraay, *Race, State, and Armed Forces in Independence-Era Brazil: Bahia, 1790s–1840s* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2001); Zephyr Frank, *Dutra's World: Wealth and Family in Nineteenth-Century Rio de Janeiro* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2004); João José Reis, *Domingos Sodré, um sacerdote africano: escravidão, liberdade e candomblé na Bahia do século XIX* (São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 2008); Marcelo MacCord, *Artífices da cidadania: mutualismo, educação e trabalho no Recife oitocentista* (Campinas: Editora da UNICAMP, 2013).

4. Sidney Chalhoub, "The Precariousness of Freedom in a Slave Society," *International Review of Social History* 56, no. 3 (November 2011): 437. See also Judy Bieber Freitas, "Slavery and Social Life: Attempts to Reduce Free People to Slavery in the Sertão Mineiro, 1850–1870," *Journal of Latin American Studies* 26, no. 3 (1994): 597–619.

5. Nevertheless, Alain El Youssef's *Imprensa e escravidão: política e tráfico negreiro no Império do Brasil, Rio de Janeiro, 1822–1850* (São Paulo: Intermeios, 2016), chap. 3, demonstrates pro-slavery mobilizations in the 1830s.

6. *Diário de Pernambuco*, April 20, 1888.

7. Jeffrey Needell, "Brazilian Abolitionism, Its Historiography, and the Uses of Political History," *Journal of Latin American Studies* 50, no. 2 (May 2010): 257.

8. *Diário de Pernambuco*, May 4, 1888.

9. Cowling, *Conceiving Freedom*, 163–88.

10. André Rebouças, *Diário e Notas Autobiográficas*, ed. Ana Flora Verissimo and Inacio José Verissimo (Rio de Janeiro: Olympio, 1938), 312.

11. Andrew Kirkendall, *Class Mates: Male Student Culture and the Making of a Political Class in Nineteenth-Century Brazil* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2002), 119–41.

12. On abolitionist associationism in Recife, see Castilho, *Slave Emancipation*, chaps. 1, 3.

13. Carolina Vianna Dantas, "Monteiro Lopes, 1867–1910: um 'líder da raça negra' na capital da república," *Afro-Ásia* 41 (2010): 169–73; Renata Figueiredo Moraes, "As festas da Abolição: o 13 de Maio e seus significados no Rio de Janeiro, 1888–1908," (PhD diss., Catholic University of Rio de Janeiro, 2012), 296–99; Martha Abreu and Carolina Vianna Dantas, "É chegada 'a ocasião da negrada bumbar': comemorações da Abolição, música e política na primeira república," *Varia História* 27, no. 45 (January–June 2011): 110–13; Flávio dos Santos Gomes and Petrônio Domingues, "'*Vai ficar tudo preto*': Monteiro Lopes e a cor na política," in *Da nitidez e invisibilidade: legados do pós-emancipação no Brasil*, ed. Flávio dos Santos Gomes and Petrônio Domingues (Belo Horizonte: Fino Traço, 2013), 127–56.

14. Castilho, *Slave Emancipation*, 165; emphasis added.

15. *Jornal do Recife*, April 28, 1888.

16. *Diário de Pernambuco*, April 29, 1888.

17. Ibid., May 4, 1888.

18. Ibid., May 17, 1888.

19. *Jornal do Recife*, May 3, 1888. A *quilombo* was a runaway slave settlement.

20. *Diário de Pernambuco*, June 12, 1888.

21. Ibid.

22. Ibid., June 15, 1888.

23. Ibid., June 13, 1888.

24. Jeffrey C. Mosher, "Political Mobilization, Party Ideology, and Lusophobia in Nineteenth-Century Brazil: Pernambuco, 1822–1850," *Hispanic American Historical Review* 80, no. 4 (2000): 881–912.

25. *Diário de Pernambuco*, July 27, 1888.

26. Ibid., August 3, 1888.

27. Ibid., July 26, 1888.

28. Ibid., June 3, 1888; *Jornal do Recife*, June 3, 1888.

29. *Diário de Pernambuco*, July 19, 1888.

30. Ibid., August 5, 1888.

31. Ibid.

32. Ibid., August 7, 1888.

33. Américo Jacobina Lacombe, Eduardo Silva, and Francisco de Assis Barbosa, *Rui Barbosa e a queima dos arquivos* (Rio de Janeiro: Fundação Casa Rui Barbosa, 1988).

34. *Diário de Pernambuco*, January 22, 1889.

35. Kim D. Butler, *Freedoms Given, Freedoms Won: Afro-Brazilians in Post-Abolition São Paulo and Salvador* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1998), 168–209; Wlamyra Albuquerque, *O jogo da dissimulação: abolição e cidadania negra no Brasil* (São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 2009), 140–94; Augusto Oliveira Mattos, *Guarda Negra: A Redemptora e o Ocaso do Império* (Brasília: Hinterlândia, 2009); Israel Ozanam, "Capoeira e Capoeiras entre a Guarda Negra e a Educação Física no Recife" (master's thesis, Federal University of Pernambuco, 2013), 35–55.

36. Castilho, *Slave Emancipation*, 187–91.

37. *Jornal do Recife*, August 1, 1889.

38. *Diário de Pernambuco*, January 12, 1889; Albuquerque, *O jogo da dissimulação*, 140–47.

39. *Jornal do Recife*, July 12, 1889.

40. Ibid., September 1, 1889.

41. This idea of the political contestation as a dispute over public space is drawn from exchanges with Camilo Trumper. See Camilo D. Trumper, *Ephemeral Histories: Public Art, Politics, and the Struggle for the Streets in Chile* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2016).

42. *Diário de Pernambuco*, August 29, 1889.

43. Ibid., August 7, 1889.

44. *Jornal do Recife*, August 10, 1889.

45. Ibid., September 1, 1889.

46. *Diário de Pernambuco*, August 31 & September 7, 1889; *Jornal do Recife*, August 30, 1889.

47. Butler, *Freedoms Given, Freedoms Won*, 67–128; James Woodward, *A Place in Politics: São Paulo, Brazil, from Seigneurial Republicanism to Regionalist Revolt* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2009), 32–71, 143–87; Roger Kittleson, *Practice of Politics in Postcolonial Brazil* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2006), 149–82.

CONTRIBUTORS

IKUKO ASAKA is an assistant professor of history at the University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign. Her first book, *Tropical Freedom: Climate, Settler Colonialism, and Black Exclusion in the Age of Emancipation* (Duke University Press, 2017), examines the intersections of settler colonialism and emancipation in the eighteenth- and nineteenth-century British and U.S. Empires. Her work has also appeared in the *Journal of African American History* and *American Quarterly*.

CAREE A. BANTON is an assistant professor of Afro-Caribbean history at the University of Arkansas, with a joint appointment in History and African and African American Studies. Her research focuses on movements related to abolition, emancipation, and colonization as well as nineteenth-century ideas of citizenship, blackness, and nationhood. She is currently working on a book, *"More Auspicious Shores": British Colonial Barbadians and the Making of the Liberian Republic, 1865–1912*, which explores continuities and mutabilities in black experiences of freedom, citizenship, and nationhood across the Atlantic world.

CELSO THOMAS CASTILHO is an assistant professor of history at Vanderbilt University. He is the author of *Slave Emancipation and Transformations in Political Citizenship* (University of Pittsburgh Press, 2016). He is also coeditor (with Maria Helena Pereira Toledo Machado) of *Tornando-Se Livre: Agentes Históricos e Lutas Sociais no Processo de Abolição* (EDUSP, 2015) and is helping to organize a dossier on Spanish American abolitions that will appear in *Historia Mexicana* in 2018.

GAD HEUMAN is a professor emeritus at the University of Warwick. He is the author of *Between Black and White: Race, Politics, and the Free Coloreds in Jamaica, 1792–1865* (Greenwood, 1981), *The Killing Time: The Morant Bay Rebellion in Jamaica* (University of Tennessee Press, 1994), and *The Caribbean* (Hodder Arnold, 2006). He serves as editor of *Slavery and Abolition*.

MARTHA S. JONES is the Society of Black Alumni Presidential Professor of History at Johns Hopkins University. A historian of gender, race, and law in the nineteenth-century United States, she is the author of *Birthright Citizens: A History of*

Race and Rights in Antebellum America (Cambridge University Press, 2017), *All Bound Up Together: The Woman Question in African American Public Culture, 1830–1900* (University of North Carolina Press, 2007), and coeditor (with Mia Bay, Farah J. Griffin, and Barbara D. Savage) of *Toward an Intellectual History of Black Women* (University of North Carolina Press, 2015).

PHILIP KAISARY is an assistant professor of critical legal, social, and political theory in the Department of Law and Legal Studies at Carleton University, where he holds cross appointments in the Department of English Language and Literature and the Institute for Comparative Studies in Literature, Art, and Culture. He is author of *The Haitian Revolution in the Literary Imagination: Radical Horizons, Conservative Constraints* (University of Virginia Press, 2014) as well as articles in *Atlantic Studies*, *Law and Humanities*, and *Slavery and Abolition* on topics including Haiti's early independence constitutions, hemispheric American literary and cultural history, and human rights.

JOHN GARRISON MARKS is external relations coordinator with the American Association for State and Local History and a historian of race and slavery in the Atlantic world. His forthcoming book examines racial identity and social mobility among free people of color in the urban black Atlantic. He is the author of articles in *Atlantic Studies* and the *Southwestern Historical Quarterly*.

PAUL J. POLGAR is an assistant professor of history at the University of Mississippi, specializing in slavery, race, and emancipation in early America and the broader Atlantic world. He is currently working on a book, *A Well Grounded Hope: Abolishing Slavery and Racial Inequality in Early America*, that reinterprets the history of American abolitionism and has published articles in the *Journal of the Early American Republic*, *American Nineteenth Century History*, and the *Massachusetts Historical Review*.

JAMES E. SANDERS is a professor of history at Utah State University. He is the author of *Contentious Republicans: Popular Politics, Race, and Class in Nineteenth-Century Colombia* (Duke University Press, 2004) and *The Vanguard of the Atlantic World: Creating Modernity, Nation, and Democracy in Nineteenth-Century Latin America* (Duke University Press, 2014).

JULIE SAVILLE is an associate professor of history at the University of Chicago. She is the author of *The Work of Reconstruction: From Slave to Wage Laborer in South Carolina* (Cambridge University Press, 1994), which received the 1995 Avery Craven Prize from the Organization of American Historians. She is also the coeditor of two volumes in *The Papers of Frederick Douglass* (Yale University Press) and of *The Wartime Genesis of Free Labor: The Lower South* (Cambridge University Press, 1990). She is currently working on a study of popular politics and resistance to reenslavement in the eastern Caribbean during the age of Atlantic revolutions.

MATTHEW SPOONER is an assistant professor of history at the University of Michigan. His teaching and research focus on the history of Atlantic slavery and the

political economy of early America. His current book project, *Origins of the Old South*, examines how a chaotic war for liberty gave rise to the most politically powerful slaveholding class the modern world has seen.

WHITNEY NELL STEWART is an assistant professor of historical studies and an affiliate of the Edith O'Donnell Institute of Art History at the University of Texas at Dallas. Her work examines the intersection of material culture and race in the nineteenth-century United States and has appeared in the *Journal of Social History*.

ANDREW N. WEGMANN is an assistant professor of history at Delta State University. He is the author of *Skin Color and Social Practice: The Problem of Race and Class in the Atlantic South, 1718–1862* (forthcoming) as well as a contributor to *U.S. History: A Top Hat Interactive Textbook* (2016). His work has appeared in the *Journal of Transatlantic Studies*, the *Journal of African-American History*, and the *Journal of the Early Republic*.

This page intentionally left blank

RACE IN THE ATLANTIC WORLD, 1700–1900

The Hanging of Angélique: The Untold Story of Canadian Slavery and the Burning of Old Montréal
BY AFUA COOPER

Christian Ritual and the Creation of British Slave Societies, 1650–1780
BY NICHOLAS M. BEASLEY

African American Life in the Georgia Lowcountry: The Atlantic World and the Gullah Geechee
EDITED BY PHILIP MORGAN

The Horrible Gift of Freedom: Atlantic Slavery and the Representation of Emancipation
BY MARCUS WOOD

The Life and Letters of Philip Quaque, the First African Anglican Missionary
EDITED BY VINCENT CARRETTA AND TY M. REESE

In Search of Brightest Africa: Reimagining the Dark Continent in American Culture, 1884–1936
BY JEANNETTE EILEEN JONES

Contentious Liberties: American Abolitionists in Post-Emancipation Jamaica, 1834–1866
BY GALE L. KENNY

We Are the Revolutionists: German-Speaking Immigrants and American Abolitionists after 1848
BY MISCHA HONECK

The American Dreams of John B. Prentis, Slave Trader
BY KARI J. WINTER

Missing Links: The African and American Worlds of R. L. Garner, Primate Collector
BY JEREMY RICH

Almost Free: A Story about Family and Race in Antebellum Virginia
BY EVA SHEPPARD WOLF

To Live an Antislavery Life: Personal Politics and the Antebellum Black Middle Class
BY ERICA L. BALL

Flush Times and Fever Dreams: A Story of Capitalism and Slavery in the Age of Jackson
BY JOSHUA D. ROTHMAN

Diplomacy in Black and White: John Adams, Toussaint Louverture, and Their Atlantic World Alliance
BY RONALD ANGELO JOHNSON

Enterprising Women: Gender, Race, and Power in the Revolutionary Atlantic
BY KIT CANDLIN AND CASSANDRA PYBUS

Eighty-Eight Years: The Long Death of Slavery in the United States, 1777–1865
BY PATRICK RAEL

Finding Charity's Folk: Enslaved and Free Black Women in Maryland
BY JESSICA MILLWARD

The Mulatta Concubine: Terror, Intimacy, Freedom, and Desire in the Black Transatlantic
BY LISA ZE WINTERS

The Politics of Black Citizenship: Free African Americans in the Mid-Atlantic Borderland, 1817–1863
BY ANDREW K. DIEMER

Punishing the Black Body: Marking Social and Racial Structures in Barbados and Jamaica
BY DAWN P. HARRIS

Race and Nation in the Age of Emancipations
EDITED BY WHITNEY NELL STEWART AND JOHN GARRISON MARKS